DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 789 HE 002 888

TITLE	Women and Education: A Feminist Perspective.
INSTITUTION	Modern Language Association of America, New York, N. Y. Commission on the Status of Women.; Pittsburgh Univ., Pa.
PUB DATE	Nov 71
NOTE	162p.; Conference proceedings, November 5-7, 1971
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Females; *Feminism; *Higher Education; *Social Values; *Womens Education; Working Women

ABSTRACT

This document presents the proceedings of the conference on Women and Education: A Feminist Perspective. The papers presented at the conference were: Why Women's Studies and How Sexism and Social Change; Research in Psychology Relevant to the Situation of Women; Women and the Visual Arts; The Woman in the Moon: Toward an Integration of Women's Studies; The Sexist Image of Women in Literature; Why Women's History?; A Feminist in Every Classroom; Women, Education, and Social Power; What Women's Studies Can Do for Women's Liberation; Feminine Subculture and Female Mind; Sexism in Textbooks; Women's Studies as a Scholarly Discipline; Women as Scapegoats; Teaching Women's Studies: An Experiment at Stout State; and Feminist Studies: Frill or Necessity. (HS)

ED 060789

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

WOMEN AND EDUCATION:
A Feminist Perspective

NOVEMBER 5-7, 1971

Sponsored by

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

And

MLA COMMISSION ON THE
STATUS OF WOMEN

Rae Lee Siporin, Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 888

A NOTE TO PARTICIPANTS

Now that November 5th has arrived, I find myself in the strange position of actually welcoming you all though formally and in writing. Hopefully I will meet each participant, at least once. Preparing this conference over the past few months, I have come to realize the excitement engendered by Feminist study; the enthusiasm of each of you is infectious and sustaining. The overwhelmingly positive response to the conference has been at times the one sustaining element during periods of concern about finances, housing, late papers etc. The real desire of all participants to get together, to talk, to share experiences is heartening. In fact, the most personally exciting and uplifting aspect of this conference has been the cooperation, among Pitt participants and among invited guests who often, to my initial dismay and eventual delight, contacted friends and students inviting them to participate. The initial spirit of cooperation, the willingness to learn stands out and sets this conference apart from any other I've been involved with.

Several of the working papers directly discuss the question and problem of power as it affects women. The suggestion has been made that we must find modes of action less destructive than competetiveness; that we must work collectively and truly cooperate with one another. The initial response of participants in letters to me has been in this very spirit. Almost all letters mention the excitement of learning from others in the conference, of taking back to beginning programs ideas and suggestions from other's experiences. Few if any have indicated that they have final answers. All have insisted upon the need to share and gain support from the work of others.

The conference itself was conceived during another conference on innovative education when it became obvious that women were not only ignored, women as students and the problems of women were not considered important enough to discuss. The goal for this weekend was simple: We would meet and offer recommendations about the education of women. These would then be collated and made available to any and all who are working to establish a program of women's studies. A second and equally important goal has evolved during the planning - this conference must serve as a teaching and learning model. It must provide a genuine learning experience for all participants. Each participant has been selected because she is an "expert" in her own right and thus has to offer expertise in her own area as well as to gain knowledge in other areas. As one paper suggests, we can no longer afford to follow the male pattern of waiting for an authority to tell us. We must work with each other, we must take the lead and develop new constructive modes of relating to each other. And recognizing and developing this new mode is the second goal of the conference.

The planning and directing of the conference especially serving as catalytic agent to bring together 90 people who want to be together has been an extremely rewarding personal experience. Learning firsthand that women work creatively, intensely, and dependably together has strengthened my own resolve. Two people deserve special consideration from me and from the conference as a whole - my secretary, Cece Candalor who worked weekends and overtime, who consoled me, who took chaotic orders and without whom there would be no conference; an undergraduate student, Kathy Davis whose advice and help during the last week distinguished her as an assistant director. Without her aid, there would be no housing, the undergraduates might have rebelled and we would have been without groups. Her personal support is second only to that of my secretary. We like to believe that we have provided the externals - the occasion, the place, the stimulus. The work is now up to you. The conference is yours.

Welcome!

Rae Lee Siporin

Rae Lee Siporin
Director, Women and Education: A Feminist Perspective

WOMEN AND EDUCATION:
A FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE

Schedule of Events

FRIDAY, November 5, 1971	
7:00 - 8:00 PM	Cocktail Hour - STOUFFER'S
8:00 PM	Dinner and General Conversation - STOUFFER'S
SATURDAY, November 6, 1971	
9:30 - 10:00 AM	Coffee Hour - 232 CATHEDRAL OF LEARNING
10:00 - 12:00 AM	Group Sessions (as assigned)
12:30 - 1:30 PM	Lunch - GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH CAFETERIA
1:30 - 2:30 PM	Film - GSPH - "Growing Up Female: As Six Become One"
3:00 - 4:00 PM	Group Sessions (as assigned)
SUNDAY, November 7, 1971	
9:30 - 10:00 AM	Coffee Hour - 244 CATHEDRAL OF LEARNING
10:00 - 11:00 AM	Discipline Caucus - 244 CATHEDRAL OF LEARNING
11:00 - 12:00 AM	Plenary: Discipline Reports 244 CATHEDRAL OF LEARNING
12:30 - 1:30 PM	Lunch - BALLROOM, SCHENLEY HALL
1:30 - 3:30 PM	Group Sessions (as assigned)

ADJOURN

CONTENTS

WORKING PAPERS:

BART, Pauline B.
Why Women's Studies and How Sexism and Social Change: From the Guilded Cage to the Iron Cage. 1
Or - The Perils of Pauline. 7

BARUCH, Grace
Research in Psychology Relevant to the Situation of Women . . 26

CHAPMAN, Gretel
Women and the Visual Arts 34

DAVIS, Devra Lee
The Woman in the Moon: Towards and Integration of Women's Studies 36

FERGUSON, Mary Ann
The Sexist Image of Women in Literature 41

GORDON, Linda
Why Women's History?. 48

KROUSE, Agate Nesaule
A Feminist in Every Classroom 52

LANDY, Marcia
Women, Education, and Social Power. 58

LEWIS, Eleanor J.
What Women's Studies Can Do for Women's Liberation. 70

REEVES, Nancy
Feminine Subculture and Female Mind 72

SCHMIDT, Dolores Barracanto
Sexism in Textbooks 82

SHERWIN, Susan S.
Women's Studies as a Scholarly Discipline: Some Questions for Discussion. 88

STIMPSON, Catharine R.
Women as Scapegoats 91

TOBIAS, Sheila, KUSNETZ, Ella
Teaching Women's Studies: An Experiment at Stout State . . . 101

SALZMAN-WEBB, Marilyn
Feminist Studies: Frill or Necessity 111

Participant Vitae. 125

WHY WOMEN'S STUDIES AND HOW

Pauline B. Bart

It is not the consciousness of men that determine their existence. Rather it is their existence that determines their consciousness.

Karl Marx, Critique of Political Economy

It is no accident that women faculty are excluded whenever possible from universities. When the criteria for appropriate professional behavior as well as for what is "important" research are made by men, we should not be surprised when such criteria mean that few women "make the grade" or meet their criteria. This statement should not be understood to mean that I believe that there are biological differences between men and women such that women cannot function in an intellectual capacity or cannot work with graduate students or cannot do vital research. What I am saying is that how you see the world, what your values are, is related to where you are located in the social structure. Because sex role, or gender, is one factor, as is class or ethnicity, in placing us structurally there tend to be certain differences in style between women and men.

The $100 dollar Misunderstanding is a brilliant exercise in the sociology of knowledge. It is the story of a weekend encounter between a fourteen year old black prostitute and an upper middle class arrogant up-tight white college boy. Each chapter is written twice -- once from his perspective and once from hers. Any relation between the two is purely coincidental. They see different facets of "reality" and interpret these facets from different frames of reference. Perhaps the difference between males and females of similar class and ethnicity is not so great. But differences there are. And since men have the power they confuse their own world view, with "reality" (resulting in what has been called "our hairy chested foreign policy") and in terms of their standards and their values we just don't cut the mustard. As Jesse Bernard put it:

> It (sexism) is the naive, unconscious, take-for-granted unexamined acceptance by sociologists of the idea that . . . sociology as developed by man is the one and only sociology worth bothering with . . . that society as men experience it is the only society worth research, that the topics men sociologists are concerned about -- expecially power, mobility, conflict -- are the only kinds worth pursuing (1970)

And Alice Rossi (1970) notes that "passion is the second typically neglected component in sociology:

> To read the works of most sociologists of any generation . . . is to gain an image of bloodless insensates looking down at human behavior from some cognitive height of detachment.

She points out the emphasis on rationality, systems analysis and game theory, and suspects "That there have been three dozen studies of achievement motivation to every one study on affiliation need." And I should point out that in the most famous of these studies, that of McClelland * only men are studied. Women in the academic world are not only metaphorically invisible; they are often in fact and in research invisible.

I will discuss five areas in which the male perspective works to the detriment of women. I should point out that some women share this perspective. They have this "falso consciousness" because in order to "make it" they introjected male values and standards and so to speak became "more Catholic than the Pope." But some of them are now confronting the fact that they have been discriminated against for many years and their position is changing. I should also add that the difference in perspective on research is more obvious in fields such as sociology and psychology than in, say, mathematics. But the criteria of what is professional demeanor (that of an English lord running the gamut of emotions from A to A-) are similar in law, medicine (where there are only three physicians than ours -South Vietnam, Madagascar and Spain) accounting and the academic world from Astronomy and Zoology. And I will discuss the implication of this for teaching not only women's courses but for teaching in general.

1. Contraception: With the exception of the condom and the vasectomy, the bulk of research and the focus of birth control has been on the female. One male M. D. couldn't understand why this was an issue. As he put it "After all women are the ones that get pregnant." And here I thought belief in immaculate conception was limited to certain diminishing religious groups. This is not a moot point, since although the condom can diminish male sex enjoyment it does not have dangerous side effects as do the two most recent female contraceptives, the "pill" and the IUD (how many of you knew that anemia was a common side effect of the latter?) The brilliant satire "How to Hold a Wife: A Bridegroom's Guide" (Macleod, 1971) makes this point effectively in the following passage:

> Assuming that you, like most modern couples, want to limit and space the growth of your family, your wife and you should decide together what method of contraception you wish to employ. Most likely, you will choose one of the fine methods available to the modern husband. Consult a qualified urologist. She will explain to you several methods . . .
>
> One widely used method is the insertion of sperm-killing liquid into the urethra before intercourse. She (your doctor) will show you how. You may find it awkward and uncomfortable the first few times, but soon you will get the knack. If you are a truly considerate husband, you will do this routinely, every evening

*This same McClelland greeted entering graduate students to Harvard with the statement that women didn't belong in graduate school. They didn't have that kind of intelligence and besides men wouldn't like them, according to Naomi Weisstein, who, together with other new graduate students in psychology, was the recipient of this advice.

as you prepare to retire, so that you will never have to keep your wife waiting while you make your preparations. A drawback of this method is that it does occasionally fail. And some wives -- especially busy, successful ones for whom the time required for the abortion is a hardship -- blame the husband for the slip-up -- thinking that perhaps he did not take the proper precautions. The other widely used method of course is the Capsule, a powerful formula of various hormones that render you infertile so long as you take it without fail. There are minor undesirable side effects in some men: you may gain weight around the abdomen or buttocks, get white pigmentless patches on your face . . . or suffer some morning nausea. But be patient -- these effects often decrease or even disappear after a few months. The one serious drawback of the Capsule is that you are several times more likely than otherwise to suffer eventually from prostate cancer or fatal blood clots. But these ailments are relatively uncommon anyway, so that many couples consider it worth the risk, especially since this is the one method that is 100 percent effective.

But no wonder, since in looking at two 1971 editions of textbooks in obstetrics and gynecology I found that one of them defined the "feminine core" as narcissistic, masochistic and passive for the "mature woman." For example, her feminine narcissism as contrasted with neurotic narcissism was to dress for men. And her feminine mature masochism was demonstrating by sacrificing her personality for her husband and her children (Willson et al. 1971). The other gave the following advice to the bride (Novak et al 1971):

> The bride should be advised to allow her husband's sex drive to set their pace, and she should attempt to gear her satisfaction to his. If she finds after several months of years that this is not possible, she is advised to consult her physician.

Bypassing her husband?

2. Childbirth and Breastfeeding: The work of Niles Newton, a woman psychologist located in a department of psychiatry (many women Ph.D.'s, like myself, are not primarily appointed in their own disciplines for reasons I have hypotheses about but will not go into at this time) shows that childbirth could be made much more meaningful if certain procedures were instituted, such as not moving the woman from the labor room to the delivery room (her studies of mice shows that environmental disturbance delays labor) and not shaving pubic hair (research, carefully controlled; done years ago demonstrated that this practice did not decrease infection, its presumed value, but it continues). Much time is spent training doctors about formulas for babies and very little time on how to help the woman breastfeed successfully. She points out that the main focus of research has been on sexuality in intercourse rather than on alternative and supplementary forms of sexual gratification such as breastfeeding and natural childbirth.

3. Depression and psychoanalytic theory: First, depression is roughly three times as likely to occur in women than in men, in contrast with other "pathologies" or forms of "mental illness." Yet until very recently it was relatively ignored in the psychiatric and psychological literature, compared with, for example schizophrenia. Now this may not necessarily mean a causal relationship between the two, yet it is interesting. But there is a built in contradiction in psychoanalytic theory as follows. First, women according to Freud, have weaker super-egoes than men (all you thought you suffered from was penis envy? uh uh -- you're also missing a sense of ethics and of justice). But this same theory accounts for depression with reference to rigid overdeveloped superegos. While analyst recognized and stated that women were more likely to become depressed nowhere in the literature was this dissonance discussed. Sexists make bad scientists.

4. Field independence-dependence: One trait that fairly consistently distinguishes between boys and girls, men and women, is the trait of field independence -- of separation of figure from ground. Women are more likely to be field dependent than men. Feminists or people sympathetic to women have shown that under certain conditions women can be field independent. But until very recently no one has questioned the superiority of field independence for intellectual performance. Yet when Mary Stewart reported her dissertation findings (1971) it immediately struck me that for certain purposes, such as sociology, it was very useful to be aware of the "ground" or "environment." In any case not being able to see the forest for the trees was not superior to not being able to see the trees for the forest. And I just learned that a psychologist at York University has made this point and therefore has changed the term from field dependence (a bad word) to field "sensitive." The taken for granted superiority of field independence furnishes another example of how the way men view the world has been considered arbitrarily to be superior than the way women see the world.

5. Studies about women: Many women sociologists and social psychologists (and Leo Kanaowitz when writing Women and the Law) learned that the very process of writing about women, of taking them seriously, put us beyond the pale of approved, high status, professional behavior. One woman's work was dismissed as "that women's lib stuff" and she was considered "completely unprofessional" even though the work was empirical and used sophisticated methodology. It was not simply polemic. My work on depression in middle aged women was greeted with marked lack of enthusiasm exemplified by one of my male friends, an eminant sociologist saying,"Pauline Bart, why did you study middle aged women?" It is very unhip, unfashionable, and unexciting to my male colleagues, although women universally have found it fascinating. An article on that topic was rejected by Trans-action several years ago, but accepted last year when a woman editor edited a special issue on women. Now of course it is considered very good, although the men are somewhat taken aback when I tell them that if it is so good why wasn't the article published earlier, and why did I have such a hard time finding a publisher for the dissertation. Other women have had similar difficulties doing research on women. One of them can not write a dissertation testing her conceptualization of women as double deviants because she cannot find the necessary faculty sponsorship. She can find the sponsorship for other topics so it is not a question of her competence, but of the topic. And again men are confusing their interests with what is valuable in the field.

The need for studying women itself is questioned, and, as one of my former distinguished colleagues at Berkeley asked "Is there really enough to teach a whole quarter?" (the first course on women given at Berkeley which I gave in 1969).

The most dramatic example of the importance of a female perspective can be demonstrated by the difference in reception of the Kinsey report on the female in 1953 and Masters and Johnson in the consciousness-raised sixties. Kinsey came out with many of the same conclusions about the myth of the vaginal orgasm that Masters and Johnson did a decade later. (see the Pocket Book version of the Kinsey report on the female pp. 574-584) For knowledge to spread it needs two factors. First the knowledge itself, and second a group in whose interest it is to have the knowledge spread. Had there been a Women's Liberation movement when Semmelweiss was pleading with doctors attending women in childbirth to please wash their hands such advice would have been paid attention to. Similarly it is only because in the sixties there is a women's movement that this time the findings about female orgasm (contradicting the psychoanalytic theory) have been disseminated. No longer will thousands of women believe there is something wrong with them if they have "cliteral" rather than "vaginal" orgasms. No longer will they believe that they are therefore immature or have "penis envy." (penis envy of course is another example of generalizing from a male perspective)

To return to the definition of "appropriate" professional behavior, and remembering that the greater "nurturance" behavior of women is more parsimoniously explained by a nurture than by a nature theory, I would like to make the point that it is precisely in that area most difficult for women to crack, teaching in graduate school, that they are most likely to be superior. Teaching graduate students is the academic equivalent of making chicken soup. What do you do? First you write grant proposals so you can support them financially. Then you have an intimate enough relationship with them for socialization to take place. Next you write them recommendations so that they can obtain fellowships, post doctorates, etc. and finally it is your responsibility to find them jobs. I find absolutely no discontinuity between this behavior and the standard behavior expected of females. Maybe one of the reasons there has been so much protest and alienation among our finest students has been precisely because while this nurturant relationship is necessary for a rewarding graduate school education, men have a "trained incapacity" to fulfill this role. While I was at Berkeley only one * female graduate student dropped out, and she did so before she took a course with me. When I invited her to my "brunch to lunch" seminar in the sociology of knowledge and said to her "Now isn't education pleasant. Isn't this a good way of life?" she said that it was too late, but she wished someone had done that earlier. Only today one of the medical students I teach remarked, in a discussion of sex roles, that he found it difficult to be interpersonally sensitive to his patients, which he must be to be a good doctor, because this skill had been trained out of him in his socialization as a male.

It follows from this discussion that I believe that we should not teach women's courses, or any courses, for that matter, the way they are traditionally

* Another was a Black student who returned to the South and didn't want to have relationships with white professors, male or female.

taught, because those methods are derived from a system that devalued us and our contribution. Besides its's an ineffective way to teach. Even at a large university it is possible to humanize education. In Berkeley I rented houses with large living rooms and held as many classes as possible in my home (and all my seminars) over wine and usually other food, and in a relaxed atmosphere, the phone ringing, my children wandering through, in a much more "real life" setting than the groves of academe. In the seminar on sex roles I teach at Chicago Circle campus, too far away from my home to use it as a base, the hours are from 9 to 11:30 a.m. and we adjourn to a nearby Greek restaurant for lunch. Most often seminars are given in the late afternoon making it difficult for women with children to attend. The O.B.-Gynecology students I talked with today suggested that we "rap," so I am setting aside Wednesday evening for dinner on the campus in a comfortable room in the student union for this purpose. The student who organized this session suggested to them that they bring their wives.* I intended to tell the first year medical students I will start teaching in November about this plan and invite them to join us. Needless to say in all the courses I teach, not just the ones on sex roles or women, I introduce feminist literature.

I will close on an even more personal note, since we in the women's movement know that the personal and the political are not separate. I am a casualty of the fifties. One of the walking wounded Betty Friedan described so well. And though I "reentered" I still bear the scars, (e.g. I was told I was too old to be an assistant professor). And I went through sheer hell for the four years I was on the job market until I finally obtained a regular position as assistant professor (but in a department of psychiatry with a joint appointment to sociology). There are things that happened that it is too late to undo. The only thing that makes any of this suffering meaningful, and nothing is more painful than meaningless suffering, is that both through my work and my example, I make it possible for others to escape -- to survive the academic experience without the horror stories that characterize women of my generation. And that is why I write about women, and work for the women's movement. It is truly unalienated labor. It comes from both my head and my heart.

The men in my field have now paid me their highest compliment. They tell me that I am not like other women. I of course respond with the only possible answer, "Yes I am."

* only one woman in the class

SEXISM AND SOCIAL SCIENCE:
FROM THE GILDED CAGE TO THE IRON CAGE[1]
OR
THE PERILS OF PAULINE

Pauline B. Bart

Cooptation is the sincerest form of flattery. And so I consider it a compliment that this year, the year of the woman, we were transformed, Cinderella like, from professional invisibility to professional desirability. It was chic to have a liberated woman at a party. Men would tell us, often in non-sequitors, how friendly they were with Betty Friedan, what excellent work Alice Rossi does, how many women were going to be teaching in their departments next year (never mind about last year) and how, in their case women's liberation had nothing to be concerned about -- they had always been for women's liberation. Even more so than their wives, in fact, who really wanted to stay home. Publishers spoke of the abundance of riches that would shower on us were we to edit a book on women to meet the needs of the flood of women's studies courses and courses on sex roles they expected (just like the Black Studies they thought). An editor of a publishing house which had rejected my dissertation for publication twice, wrote me a letter telling me that, on the basis of an article I had written which he read, "Portnoy's Mother's Complaint", he had been "thinking", and had come to the conclusion that my work was extremely important, his house was the most appropriate for that topic and wouldn't I consider submitting it to them for publication. I replied that I quite agreed with everything he said which was why I had submitted it twice previously but that meanwhile I had found another publisher.

I used to end my talks on women by saying "Be of good cheer. Tokenism is around the corner." Well, tokenism has arrived this year particularly if you were a young, attractive Ph.D. from a prestige school on the job market.

What do we mean by sexism? (See Bernard, 1970, 374-375 for a similar discussion)? Sexism is more than "simply" discrimination against women. It isn't only that it's so much harder for us to get jobs, or that the one's we get pay less, or are as Lecturers (out of the system) or Research Associates (look at the Catalogue of University of California at Berkeley to see this pattern repeated in almost every department). It isn't only that we are not taken seriously, and that psychiatric vocabularies are used to discredit us -- "castrating bitch," "All she needs is a good fuck". or (after love making) "Well, how do you feel about women's liberation now?"

Sexism is the process whereby patriarchal attitudes and behaviors are institutionalized, permeating the society from its language (use of "men" and "he" for both sexes, see Haas, 1964, for a discussion of tribes in which men and women have different speech) thru its liturgy ("Our Father who art in heaven." "I now pronounce you man and wife" (why not woman and husband?)) to its law (see Kanowitz, 1969). Sexism is integrated into the structure of society, present in each institution, so, with the "strain towards consistency" characteristic of institutions, we can look at them and see how they operate to keep women down, or in their place, which is the same thing. It is the mutual reinforcement of these institutions that makes it so difficult for a

woman to survive unscarred. For if she survives her passage through one institution, e.g. the schools, she is smashed by another e.g., the job (getting one, or being paid equal wages or being able to use her talents without "threatening" the man). And if she miraculously survives those two, there is marrage and the nuclear family to cope with, etc.

Before I present further illustrations of sexism, I should explain the reasons for the personal, informal and emotional quality of this editorial. In the women's movement we believe that the personal and the political cannot be separated. To use Mill's concept (1959) we are interweaving biography and history because we discovered that what we thought were private problems were in fact public issues. Thus our personal experiences are not juicy anecdotes to liven up a text or to gain the attention of the students who are reading the newspaper while we lecture. Our personal experiences are <u>data</u>.

Because of sexism women are in a double bind -- a no win situation. You all know the double bind. It is a theory of schizophrenia that attributes schizophrenic behavior to a pattern of communication in which the message sent (usually by the mother but more of that later) is contradictory so the receiver is damned if she does and damned if she doesn't. The third part of the double bind is that the receiver can not point out the contradiction.

Women are in a double bind when they are simultaneously told (verbally or non-verbally) to achieve and not to achieve and if they complain about the situation of women are told such complaints or concerns are "unprofessional."

Thus the double binding and the social structural base make almost all individual attempts at solution impossible (See Battlesister this issue, for a discussion of the five ways women, like other minority groups, try to respond to their situation). Following the rules doesn't work (as it didn't work with the supermothers I studied in 1970). Either you were too young, and therefore a bad risk since you would instantly leave with the first available man and start having babies, or if you returned to school <u>after</u> having children you were, "too old to be an assistant professor." If, in spite of the insecurity of our positions, the interminable packing and unpacking as we went from one temporary job to another, we managed to do research and publish. We were told that the work we did was competent but uninteresting. Who really gives a damn about reading studies, particularly feminist studies, about women, their dilemmas their problems, their attempts at solution. A number of authors (e.g. Kosa et. al 1962, Maccoby 1966 and Horner 1969) have learned that mobile (or professional) women suffer, become anxious and insecure, to an extent not approached by mobile men. So we published and perished.

Men of good will tell us hesitancy in hiring women for regular positions (e.g. U.C. Berkeley Sociology "hesitated" from 1926 to 1970) stems from the behavior of the women themselves. Blaming the oppressed for their own oppression is not a new technique. Women allegedly leave to follow their men, or to have babies, putting their personal life first. But these "facts" are open to dispute. The Report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Women of the Berkeley Academic Senate found that women's job stability was greater than men's (1970 see also Long, 1971 for a discussion of these misperceptions and the function that they serve). Even if the "unprofessional" conduct of women were true the "facts" can be interpreted differently and the causal

sequence reversed. Over the past few years this alternate interpretation has grown on me. It suggests that it is only after women learn what their real situation is, after they are treated as sex objects or non-persons after they are discouraged from doing research on women, after they are told that they must learn "to get rid of students faster" so they can do more research, but then that research is considered competent but "trivial", after they have seen what the system has done to other women, the price they paid, they may turn to a more traditional role. If they are lucky they still have that option open.

And let us take up the matter of choice. Women allegedly "choose" not to invest themselves in their work, to have jobs rather than careers, to stay home and have babies, to teach rather than to do research, to make the necessary compromises to stay married, to refuse promotions, to put their husband through graduate school at the expense of their own education. But what about the long process of socialization into the female role that results in that choice? Can we really speak of it as a free choice? And what are the alternatives, if any. As Ann Battlesister said one evening at a women's group meeting when she was discussing the impossibility of equality in love affairs:

> He said we were both free.
> Yes, we're both free, He's free to find someone who will wash his socks, and I'm free to find another slave master.

And Michelle Patterson, discussing Helen Astin's work on Academic women (1970) says:

> "She (Astin) then asks why women are 'more inclined' to work in colleges and concludes that the probable reason they 'choose' colleges is a preference for teaching over research. Perhaps this is true. But to phrase the question in that way is at least a little like asking why black students ten years ago were more inclined to choose Howard University over Harvard University(1971)."

There is another reason why there are no individual solutions, why you can't beat the system. The system is not rational so that plans to overcome the biases through rational means-end thinking don't work. For example the official line on women in academia is that they are good teachers but not research oriented. We would therefore assume that when a choice had to be made in allocating personnel men would be given research positions and women teaching positions. Since many schools have nepotism rules stating that husbands and wives cannot work in the same department, on the basis of logic it would follow that when such couples were hired the man would be the research associate and the woman hold the teaching position. But it never works out that way. The women are made research associates and the men teach.

The sociology of knowledge has sensitized us to the relationship between the substructure and the superstructure, between our location in the society -- both our socioeconomic status, our generation (see Matza 1969, Mannheim, 1936, Bart, 1970) and our perception of that society. For as Marx said "It is not the consciousness of man that determines his existence. Rather it is his existence that determines his consciousness" (1904). It is no accident

that Soviety psychotherapy emphasizes manipulation of the environment, a materialist perspective, with special attention paid to work, while American psychotherapy, particularly psychoanalysis, focuses on intrapsychic factors. Nor is it surprising that the relationship between the analyst and the analysand replicate the normative interactive pattern of the Victorian family, with the analyst assuming the role of the father or husband and the patient that of the wife or daughter (Reiff 1959). Neither is it surprising that as new forms of male-female and family interaction emerge and take hold in our society, new types of therapy are popular (See Bart, 1971 for an ideological analysis of the different kinds of psychotherapy, and Chesler's article in this issue showing how psychotherapy is used as a social control specifically over women). Since men for most of their life have more power than women, psychotherapy is in the interest of the male often pushing women back into the traditional mold. With the holy trinity of concepts describing women -- narcicism, masochism and penis envy or masculine protest, or not adjusting to her "feminine role," (translation - not wanting to stay home and cook and clean and have children and being supportive of her husband). The ruling ideas of an epoch are the ideas of its ruling class. But more of this later.

The $100 Misunderstanding (Gover, 1961) effectively illustrates that what we see reflects who we are; when each chapter is written first by an uptight smug white college boy and then by a 14 year old black prostitute. Any relationship between the two is purely coincidental. Women and men construct different social realities, and it seems that women, like other oppressed groups are more sensitive to males (the dominant group) than men are to women. They have to be to get, by means of informal power, some of what they are denied formally. It is not surprising that Freud, knower of souls, said "What do women want." I wonder if Martha Freud knew what men wanted -- I would guess she did. Just as Aristotle decided that women had fewer teeth than men, never bothering to look, Freud thought women had vaginal orgasms, if they were "mature".

Women sociologists are marginal as are all women in traditi nally male occupations. Thus they have the advantages for sociological analysis of being between two worlds although not accepted or comfortable in either. But like other marginal men, their very marginality enables them to have insights about their society different at least if not more sensitive than that of men (see Arly Hochschilde, 1970, for another discussion of the value of feminine perspective in sociology.) Would teaching marriage and the family courses be considered so inferior to teaching methodology or theory construction courses if women held power in sociology (of course women trained by sexist departments often "identify with the aggressor" and therefore hold a male determined hierarchy of what is important to do -- thus a radical young woman sociologist asked Alice Rossi "How did you manage to get stuck in a low status field like marriage and the family?")

Jessie Bernard recently stated (1970) that for the first time she was going to use personal experience as data. "Something I learned from radical women -- and it is directly relevant to the discussion here . . . since the experience use has implications for a sociology of knowledge." She makes the analogy between racism and sexism because both are practiced by men of good will with the best of intentions but the barriers to equality were built into

the structure. ." These obstacles were "standards, procedures and credentials reflecting the values of white society." "According to these standards black people were inferior."

"Discrimination against black people (read women) the logical rational, sensible, perfectly justified the basis of racist thinking. . It was not the result of bias . . but of perfectly legitimate standards, themselves the product of a white-oriented world . . they just didn't measure up."

Sexism has many striking similarities to racism. . "It is the naive, unconscious, taken for-granted unexamined acceptance by sociologists of the idea that . . sociology as developed by man is the one and only sociology worth bothering with . .that society as men experience is the only society worth researching, that the topics men sociologists are concerned about -- especially power, mobility, conflict -- are the only kinds worth pursuing." Thus it is allegedly not discrimination that makes it difficult for women to get jobs. They just don't measure up because they are (unprofessional).

To ameliorate this situation I would suggest a more pluralist view of what are appropriate acceptable professional interests and behavior. As it is now we must have the demeanor of English lords, showing the range of emotions from A to A-, behavior neither most women, most blacks, nor most Chicanos learned as part of their childhood socialization -- racism and sexism are inescapable. We are evaluated by alien standards. We are not judged by our peers. Thus, when Ralph Ellison reviewed <u>An American Dilemma</u> very critically his review was not published (Ellison, 1964) since the Caucasian editors thought it too pessimistic, when women write about women, it too is judged inadequate. Women are not as badly treated as "field niggers but in many respects they are like "house niggers" (Hacker, 1951). If she has the attributes, the beauty, the charm, to be chosen for such a role, she need not lead a life of "quiet desperation" for, by going along with the rules, being sensitive to and catering to her husband, she may lead a pleasant tranquil existence albeit not an authentic or honest one, in the gilded cage her husband will provide for her and for their children. But the price is great.

A difference between the situation of blacks and the situation of women is that when a black leader speaks and expresses a great deal of anger, his behavior, if anything, <u>enhances</u> his masculinity. On the other hand, the most frequent criticism of women in women's liberation is that they are "so shrill" and "angry." The assumption underlying this statement is that it is inappropriate, it is unfeminine, for women to be angry.

Let us continue the discussion of anger and aggression in their relationship to sexism. We know that one theory of psychological depression, a very common symptom, is introjected anger. We also know that women have a higher rate of depression than men. I believe that by learning to express the rage we feel, the rage that is "unfeminine," we are averting some of that depression. We know that biases prejudices, hamper the development of science and again here we have an example of how the perspective of the male psychiatrists limited their analysis of the causal sexes they were discussing. Freud thought that women had a less developed superego than men did (Muslin 1970). But the Freudian theory of depression states that depression is the result of an overly punitive super ego. Now, as I said above, women have a higher

rate of depression than men. Therefore, it would follow that their super egos would be more rather than less developed. Yet, according to my psychiatrist informants, no one ever remarked on this inconsistency before. If anyone noticed, it was not publicized. Phyllis Chesler and I both had the same idea at the same time -- the idea of demanding reparations from all the money that so many women have spent in psychotheray, a psychotherapy based on false assumptions about the nature of women.

A brilliant satire, "How to hold a wife: a bridegroom's guide" (Macleod: 1971), dramatized the difference between the socialization of a woman for the wife role and that of a man for the husband role by switching the sex to which the advice was directed, and inventing a magazine for young men, Modern Bridegroom.

> Oh lucky you! You are finally bridegroom to the women of your dreams! But don't think for a minute that you can now relax and be assured automatically of marital happiness forever. You will have to work at it.
>
> While she may only have eyes for you now, remember that she is surrounded every day by attractive young men who are all too willing to tempt her away from you. And as the years go by, you will lose some of the handsome muscularity of your youth: you will have to make up in skill and understanding what you will lack in the bloom of youth . . .
>
> Now men's passion, of course, often does not equal that of women. But you have a wonderful surprise in store for you, if you concentrate your efforts on your wife's pleasure and don't worry selfishly about your own. For sooner or later you will discover the ecstasy of truly mature male coital orgasm that can be induced only by total surrender to the exquisite sensations of a woman's orgasmic contractions. . .
>
> Remember that your first duty is to your wife. So if you fail to satisfy her (and yourself, too) in the above described natural way, you should talk to a good psychiatrist who specializes in this kind of problem. She will help you if, for instance, you have not yet fully accepted the natural masculine role that will bring you the joy of selfless service to others instead of the futile envy of women's natural leadership role.

To learn the proper contraceptive techniques he is advised to "Consult a qualified urologist. She will explain to you . . ."One method" is the insertion of sperm-killing liquid into the urethra before intercourse. She (your doctor) will show you how." Another commonly used method is" . . the Capsule, a powerful formulation of various hormones that render you infertile . . ." although there are some minor side effects such as weight gain, while pigmentless patches on the face which can be concealed with a face bronzer, nausea, and the possibility of prostate cancer or fatal blood clots. "But these ailments are relatively uncommon anyway, so that many

couples consider it worth the risk, especially since this is the one method that is 100 per cent effective." She closes with this paragraph:

> If you do your job well -- for husbandhood is the true career for all manly men, worthy of all your talents -- you will keep your wife happy and hold her for the rest of her days. Remember that marriage, for a man, should be Life's Great Adventure. So relax -- relax -- relax -- and enjoy.

Marcia Millman, in this issue, has given an excellent critique of the research using the concept of role, and Carol Joffe, discussing the literature on sex role socialization, notes that the present sex roles are almost always taken as givens. When I criticized the current use of sex roles I noted that while women and motherhood have been extensively studied there is very little information on fatherhood, (1970). We know from the sociology of knowledge that what is not studied can tell us as much about the ideology of a discipline as what is studied.

In sociology women, if they are seen at all, are studied primarily as wives and mothers, while men are studied fulfilling their "instrumental" roles, in the sociology of work, and the sociology of professions. In fact, the term sex role almost always refers to women in the same way that "urban problems" or "inner city problems" is a euphemism for "what are we going to do about the blacks." Not only is sex role usually a reference to women, but the crucial question often asked is "Is she adjusted to her role, and if not, why not." This perspective stems from one of the two major approaches to role in American sociology, out of Durkheim (1951), by Linton (1945) which views roles as external and constraining internalized in childhood from role models. Roles are Procrustean beds to which the individual adjusts or is adjusted. An example of this approach appeared in an article on family therapy (Davison, 1970). The mother, a woman with post-graduate education (two M.A.'s), living in four bedroom split level house, married to a successful business man and the mother of three children, discovers in the therapeutic process that "I've been fighting my role as wife and mother all these years." She "began to understand how her identity battle had grown out of her own family and came to new appreciation and rapport with her husband. Their sex-life blossomed."

To continue with sexism in sociology, we are all familiar with Parson's reformulation of the Freudian theory of socialization by introducing the concept of role differentiation and the functional prerequisite of males assuming the instrumental role and women the expressive role.[2] One might say, "Simply because the sexes are allocated different roles does not mean that one is sexist. So what if men are instrumental or women are expressive." But in instrumental activism, so, since it is men who enact this pattern, they are in an advantaged position. And guess who is described in the sociological literature as expressive, besides women, -- blacks, especially when they riot or rebel, students, especially when they demonstrate, non-whites in general, and old people. Could it be simply a coincidence that these are all the groups who are relatively powerless? Non-sexist analyses of sex roles are rarer, the best work being that of Alice Rossi (A Modest Proposal, 1964, Transition to Parenthood, (1968) The Beginning of Ideology (1969). In "the Beginning

of Ideology" she makes an eloquent plea for freedom of choice regardless of one's sex role, so that both men and women will be able to be more human. She criticizes the Parsonian distinction between expressive and instrumental roles; mothers and fathers have to have both expressive and instrumental dimensions in their roles. It is precisely this assumed difference between the sexes "that restricts theory building in family sociology and produces so much puzzlement on the part of researchers into marriage and parenthood, sex role, socialization, or personality tendencies towards masculinity or femininity."

The political utility of the instrumental expressive dichotomy became clear to me during the struggle over The People's Park in Berkeley (I was a Lecturer in Sociology at U.C. at the time). Whenever a suggestion for faculty action was made, it was put down as being "expressive" or "emotional." When I asked what instrumental action would be I was answered "Action that will get the troops off campus." Since the faculty had no power to control the troops, this approach meant we did absolutely nothing. Furthermore action could only be judged instrumental ex post facto. This instrumental expressive distinction may also explain why women university teachers seem to be more popular with the students. Because of their socialization women are less likely to split their emotions off from their intellects. Since students are now into romanticism, there is a certain rejection of what they consider sterile rationality; thus individuals who show their feelings can communicate with students and be trusted by students more than those who don't. There is an ambivalence about this. During the same incident of the Park one of my students protectively warned me that I was wandering around looking distraught. I should not be seen with any emotion on my face or it would hurt me professionally. But it seems to me that when a university is occupied by troops with bare bayonets, people are being wounded and killed over a park, not being distraught is the problem.

Sexism in sociology is an institutionalization of female's invisibility not only metaphorically but literally, in research and in professional interaction so that in two studies in which women would have been very relevant they were omitted from the samples. In "Some trends inthe social origins of American sociologists"(Glen and Weiner, 1969) the authors said "for the purpose of this paper inclusion of females would perhaps have been appropriate. But we decided to exclude them from our sample because we needed only males for most of our planned studies with the data." The authors regret the trend making "sociologists with rural backgrounds rare because American sociology may be rapidly losing a perspective that probably has considerable value to the discipline." Does it not occur to them that the under representation of 51% of the population in sociology may not also mean that the view of society presented is even more greatly biased. The second study is about social structure and depression (Linsky 1969). Now, depressives are three times as likely to be women as to be men. Yet they are excluded from the analysis because he is using measures based upon occupation and this would not be an appropriate variable to use with respect to women.

Sexism is when a woman psychologist wrote a monograph about creativity in college women and the reviewer told her that perhaps creativity in college women was worth a journal article but surely not a monograph.

Sexism is when a student in political science wanted to write a paper on women in the Chinese revolution, an important topic, and was told that she should write a paper on the role of the military in the Chinese revolution.

Sexism is the difficulty one of the graduate students in a sociology department had in finding a sponsor for her M.S. thesis on sex roles. It was also manifested in the relatively low evaluation of that work which is a comprehensive and most useful collection of material on sex role in the literature, and will be published as a book. But the professor much preferred some other work that she had done in just a few days and which she considered clearly inferior to the thesis.

It is sexism when Kinsey's demolition of the vaginal orgasm myth was overlooked when it was published in 1953. It is true that Masters and Johnson (1966) had the anatomy more accurately presented because of their research techniques, but the essential facts were in Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Yet these vital facts were not publicized. Thousands of women still thought there was something wrong with them. For information to spread two things are necessary -- first the information itself and second some person or group in whose interest it is to have the new facts known. It was only when there was a women's movement that these conditions were met. Thus it was not until Human Sexual Response (1966) was published that these facts were made generally public.

It is sexism when two male colleagues advised me to write an article called "The Sociological Theory of Depression," rather than "Depression in Middle Aged Women," since the latter would go unread (but if I really wanted to have an "in" title I could have written "A Methodological Note on a Mathematical Model of a Propositional Theory of Depression: the relevance of ethnomethodological demography.")

Sexism is a historian telling a woman graduate student who had the previous year written an analysis of women's magazines in the 19th and the 20th centuries and who this year wanted to study Southern women,"But didn't you write about women last year?" Sexism is when a colleague of mine, hearing that I was about to give a course on women, asked me, in'good faith, if there really were enough written about women to cover an entire quarter. (An unintended effect of this interchange was to inspire Laura X (Murra) to start her famous Womens' History Research Library in Berkeley.)

Sexism, and support for the sociology of knowledge perspective, is that the same article, "Portnoy's Mother's Complaint" (inexplicably retitled Mother Portnoy's Complaint) that appeared in Trans-Action (1970) in the issue edited by Arlie Hochschilde was sent to them two years before and was rejected. Similarly another article that I have written was commented on as follows by the reviewers for a journal: "Several of us have read with considerable puzzlement the piece on 'Why Women's Status Changes in Middle Age.' Although the topic is an interesting one, the paper is generally weak both conceptually and empirically." It built from there. There was nothing from these points of view in the paper of value. It was fairly clear from the article that I was a woman. I was devastated and embarrassed that I had sent out so many reprints which were requested after I had presented it at the ASA meetings in

San Francisco in 1969. All my friends like it, but I thought that they were biased. However, Zee Gamson who received one of these copies and whom I never had met, wrote: "Thanks for sending your paper which I found fascinating. Does it mean that women have to be miserable at one stage in life to be free in another? True, the young bride in China had a hell of a life under the hard eyes of her mother-in-law. Conversely the young Marquesan woman exchanged a fascinating life for one of very service later on. In which society do women die younger? Your findings would be interesting to test with men using something comparable to manopause (retirement, illness, etc.)." Clearly not only did she enjoy the article but it stimulated her thinking and she found it relevant. As I mentioned previously, there was very little interest among male sociologists in my dissertation on depressed middle-aged women, Portnoy's Mother's Complaint, until this year. In fact I was so discouraged at the reaction to it that I decided that my next study would be on men, and that is one of the reasons I started studying divorced men and their children.

It is sexism when everyone is judged by the typical male career pattern so that women who return to school after their children were raised were told that they could only be admitted for terminal M.A.'s, or that they had erratic career patterns, and this in a society with almost no child care centers, motherhood expected from each female, and salary discrimination.

For example, the interviewer who was evaluating me for a position said, "You and I are about the same age. Look what I've done and look what you've done." He had two books and I had two children.

Sexism is the laughter that used to follow remarks on discrimination against women or requests for courses on women (one sociologist, responding to the point that the women's movement was blossoming, suggested that the proposed course on women be called "The flowering and deflowering of American women").

Sexism is a husband being sent anonymous mourning cards "in sympathy for being married to that" after his wife wrote a brilliant but humanistic and gentle feminist piece.

It is Leo Kanowitz being greeted: "jokingly" while writing his book Women and the Law, (1969) "That's a nice book your wife is writing," assuming that it would be absurd or at least humorous for a man to care about such matters. One can think of these "jokes" as attempts at social control, as attempts to push the deviant individuals back into line. It would be redundant for me to discuss sexism in the field of marriage and family because this issue contains such excellent ideological analyses of the field (Gordon and Shankweiler, Gillespie's and Erlich's and Lane Laws.)

There is almost an infinite amount of data supporting the evaluation of psychotherapy as sexist. Much of what I would have said has been covered by Phyllis Chelser in her article here and in "The Radical Therapist" (1970). But I cannot resist describing a few studies. It is sexism when, in a descriptive study of pregnant patients and "normals," the investigation by the psychoanalyst follows an interview schedule where the subject's role in intercourse could be classified as "passive," "unresponsive," "resistant," "aggressive," "deviant," "other." It is when biases are built into the research itself that the ideological underpinnings are clearest and the posture of being

value-free is a patent absurdity. Another study by Broverman et al (1970) showed that when therapists were asked to describe a healthy mature socially competent adult, sex unspecified, a man, or a woman, the description given of the adult sex unspecified, and the man, were similar, that is they both were described by categories which the clinicians considered healthy, mature, and socially competent. But the descriptions of the healthy mature, socially competent woman was quite different. "More specifically, particular behaviors and characteristics may be thought indicative of pathology in members of one sex, but not pathological in members of the opposite sex." The authors suggest them, "that a double standard of health exists wherein ideal concepts of health for mature adults, sex unspecified, are meant primarily for men, less so for women." "Thus, for a woman to be healthy, from an adjustment viewpoint, she must adjust to and accept the behavioral norms for her sex, even though these behaviors are generally less socially desirable and considered to be less healthy for the generally competent, mature adult." It is not necessary at this time to repeat many excellent criticisms of the Freudian and psychoanalytic view of women, whom they describe in terms of the holy trinity of symptoms: narcicism, masochism and penis envy. While psychiatrists don't tell their female colleagues to go home and make soup and fulfill their feminine roles, their patients sometimes have this fate (Ash, 1969). Another article (Devereux, 1960) dramatically presents the psychoanalytic devaluation of women: "As a result of the female castration complex, women view their genitalia as repulsive. The need for exaggerated praise represents a need for the denial of keenly felt defect. Data are presented from both analytical and extra-analytical sources." (If you were wondering about the flavored douches such as Cupid's Quiver, or the plethora of "feminine hygiene deodorants" which have suddenly burst upon the scene, perhaps these drug companies have psychological consultants.)

Another evidence of sexism in psychotherapy is more general. It is the vocabulary which attributes all or almost all difficulty that individuals have to faulty mothering. Thus, schizophrenia was caused by the demon double-binding schizophrenogenic mother. Only recently have psychiatrists been talking about schizophrenogenic families.

A dramatic example of sexism among psychotherapists was a conference held at the Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute to deal with "The impact of the recent physiological findings on sex on psychoanalytic theory." Now the Masters and Johnson findings (1966) are very significant for women because once and for all they disprove the Freudian double-orgasm theory. Masters and Johnson also disprove the many other myths about female sexuality. Yet there was no woman on the panel, not even a token woman. Can you imagine having a panel on the implications of the recent physiological findings on race and not having a black man? Yet when some members of Women's Liberation rose in the audience and complained about the fact that there were no women and asked for permission to speak, they were not given that permission and from the audience came cries such as, "If you don't keep quiet we'll call the police." "You have no right to be here." Another example of the difference in perspective between men therapists and women therapists, though they share a common theoretical viewpoint, the psychoanalytic one, can be found by comparing the case that Charlotte Krause presents in this issue with the case that Alfred Flarsheim presented at that conference. She saw a young woman, who was very depressed because her husband, who was in law school, had left her. She thought the only way she could achieve happiness was by being married to a

successful lawyer and basking in his reflected glory, having a home and children, and being the traditional wife-"the femininity complex.""At the end of therapy the patient had changed so that she no longer felt it was necessary for her to be married. She became much more interested in her career, and therefore received much more satisfaction from her teaching skills and relating to her students. She was able to have several successful affairs with male teachers, and thus was not sexually deprived by notbeing married. She could envisage a life for herself as a single woman, even considering adopting a child should she want one, since children who are difficult to place are sometimes given to single parents.

On the other hand, Flarsheim summarizes his case as follows:

> The case is presented of a "liberated woman" who achieved orgasm regularly with every intercourse before regardless of the quality of the relationship with her sexual partners. She had no desire for children and "no understanding of them."
>
> The process of treatment is described, during which there were changes in her attitudes toward sex and toward motherhood. She developed a need for a continuing reassuring object relationship with her sexual partner as a necessary condition for orgasm, and at the same time developed a capacity to identify with infants and a wish for motherhood.

He suggests that such sexual relationships have survival value, in evolutionary terms because "A woman's need for special adaptation to her needs sets a pattern for him to make provision later, when she is a mother needing to be cared for so she can adapt to the needs of her infant."

CONCLUSION

Sex roles are loosening up. Women are changing their submissinve gestures, their compliant behavior. They are no longer feigning either ignorance or orgasms to flatter the men they are with. They are finding that the use of feminine "wiles," sub-rosa manipulation of males, dehumanizing for both men and women. Among men, while I know there is no one to one relatinship between men feminizing their dress and appearance and men changing their values and behaviour, there is a certain softening, an acceptance of passivity under certain conditions an unwillingness to die either for the corporation or for the country. We saw them throw away their medals in Washington to protest the war in Vietnam, and in so doing they were also disencumbering themselves of the symbols of traditional male qualities, the essence of which is to die bravely for one's country.

We want liberated men and women in a liberated sociology in a liberated society. In this society there will be only human roles and mothers and fathers and friends will parent children. In this society we will use our knowledge as sociologists to that end, so that, as Everet Hughes said (1949) "if a Jewish Negro girl of twenty, born in Russia and converted to the Witnesses of Johovah were fittest to be head surgeon of Massachusetts General Hospital, she would be it." Our sociology will include all races, all classes, all sexes, the rural as well as the urban, the old as well as the young. In doing so I follow Bell and Mau's dictum (1971) that intellectuals have a re-

sponsibility to create utopian images of the future, so they may act as virtuous cycles, as self-fulfilling prophecies. In this society not only will people be more important then things, people will not be made into things.

In editing this issue I did not feel bound by norms I had no part in creating, norms that have aided keeping us second class sociologists. Some of the articles are frankly political; almost all express a dislike of sexism and a committment to sexual equality. Indeed, since the topic of the issue was sexism, a value laden term, it would be absurd to have limited the contributions to the kind of sterile "value free" articles based on questionnaires passed out to one's students, that abound in the behavioral sciences. Martindale has pointed out that values are inherent in discussions of social disorganization (1960). Similarly discussions of sex roles and the institution of the family are also value laden. The only difference between authors on this point is that some are aware of their ideological or utopian assumptions and others are not. The many fine ideological analyses in this issue support t is point "A way of seeing is a way of not seeing" (Burke 1945) and what has been seen in for the most part has been seen from a white middle class male perspective. Let us hope that the recent attempts, incomplete though they may have been, to include other races and women in sociology will make the view more complete, closer to reality. Perhaps a sociology of knowledge analysis can do for sociology what a psychoanalysis can do for the individual--where id was let there be ego.

So here is where I am situated - my generational perspective. I edit this journal as a casualty of the fifties--one of the walking wounded whose scars still are not all healed. As the twenties were called "the lost generation" I am a member of the lost decade for women which Betty Friedan has described so well (1963). For us The American Dream--a house in the suburbs, numerous allegedly time-saving appliances, a husband, children, in fact turned into the American Nightmare. But we felt guilty. We thought there was something the matter with us because we were dissatisfied. Because the only vocabulary motives around in the fifties was the Freudian, we assumed our problem was intrapsychic. We were suffering from "penis envy." We were "immature." We had what I call meta-depressions--not only were we depressed because we were depressed, since, according to "experts" we suburban housewives should have been happy content fulfilled and pregnant. What was wrong with us?

The women's liberation movement has changed all this. Now we know there was nothing wrong with us, any more than there was anything wrong with a black person who had a college degree and was a janitor, or with the recent Ph.D's in physics for whom there were no jobs (of course there hardly ever were any jobs for women Ph.D's, and Time and Newsweek never had anything to say about that waste before women's liberation). We learned that what we had considered private problems were in fact public issues structurally induced (Mills 1959).

Cultures that practiced female infanticide were at least honest in how they felt about women. Better whe should have been exposed on a mountain side as infants, than to have the death of a thousand cuts which is the fate of women, particularly intelligent women, in our society.

I have arranged the articles alphabetically by author, rather than list them "in order of importance." Not only did I not wish to make invidious distinctions, but the articles were not comparable on the same dimension. For example, Ann Baxter

pliemical article addressed to the members of the women's movement who debate over whether thereis a woman's culture or not. She points out, though not in these words, that culture, like power comes out of the barrel of a gun. Hanna Papenek wrote a "straight" article following the scholarly tradition, on purdah. The Schwendingers wrote a radical intellectual history of the founders of American sociology, demonstrating that though Ward and Thomas considered their work helpful to women, with friends like that who needs enemies (they also told me that writing this article helped in their own struggle for liberation since they saw that sexism was all of a piece with racism and imperialism. It was not a trivial issue to be dealt with "later"). There are two articles on psychotherapy. Phyllis Chesler's is more militant than Charlotte Krause's, the former viewing therapy as a process of social control keeping women down, and using epidemiological data to support her point. The latter, which I discussed above, is more sympathetic to psychoanaytic approaches.

Three of the articles are sorely needed ideological analyses of popular books and studies on marriage, marital adjustment and sex. Two articles focus on occupations. Henry Etzkowitz wrote about male nurses who, because they were in traditionally female occupation, were constantly being taken for doctors, paralleling in reverse from the experience of many professional women who are always assumed to be secretaries. In contrast Jane Prather describes what happens to a previously male occupation when it becomes a glamour job. I first heard her discuss her thesis at a meeting of the Berkeley Sociology Women's Caucus and was delighted that two years later I would be instrumental in publishing it. Two articles describe the presentation of women in fiction. Bruce Williams' analyses the role of Mollie Bloom, "a sexual goldmine" who doesn't get out of been throughout the entire 800 page Ulysses (1914) while Cornelia Flora compares Latin American women's magazines with those in this country. This study is unusual in that both middle and working class publications are compared and Ms. Flora collected and analyzed much of her data in South America.

There is only one article on socialization, and that discusses sex role socializiation in a nursery school with a policy of deemphasizing sex differences. "The Dual Professional Family" elicited the most correspondence between me and the authors. My interpretations of their data was somewhat at variance with theirs and we had a stimulating intellectual discussion via the mails. Marcia Millman's critique of the literature on sex roles covers most of my arguments. Since I don't want to assume the role of politcial commissar I thought it important to publish articles and reviews that were good whether or not I agreed with them.

I decided which books were important and should be reviewed and chose the reviewer on the basis of her special competency in the area the book covered. Thus, for example, Kathleen Gough is an expert on matriliny, having written, with Schneider, Matilineal Kinship (1961), and has superb radical

credentials, having been fired from two schools for political reasons. Certainly no one is in a better position to review Engels Origin of the Family (for those of you who wonder why I include a book written in the last centruy that most scholars dismiss, this book is considered accurate by many women in the women's movement and there is much debate as to its validity).[3] Joan Stelling, who reviewed Cynthia Epstein's book, is a specialist in professional socialization. Alice Aberbanel who reviewed The Captive Housewife has brought up a child in an urban commune, has taught a course on motherhood in the Berkeley Free University, and is working out ways to rear children so that they are not viewed as private property and are not the mother's sole raison d'etre.

While all the reviews were fair and accurate, I would have been gentler with some, for example Epstein and Millet since their books help me analyze women's state, and harsher with others such as Ruitenbeck's compilation of psychoanalytic views of women, since the impact of psychoanalytic thinking has done irreperable harm to me and to many other women, particularly in the 1950's. But that is one reason to have many reviewers--the reader receives a spectrum of positions.

It is possible that no one of our generation can be so "liberated." Perhaps, like the ancient Isrealites, we will have to wander forty years in the desert before we can be free of the yoke of ascribed roles. But, as Marcial Millman points out in her critique of sex role research, if we want to find roles change we have to look at places where such changes are likely to occur--the boundaries rather than the center of society. So I will close on a hopeful note, reporting two communications from two young women living in Berkeley, a fourteen-year old ninth grader and a freshman sociology student.

A male former student of mine sent me the paper from which this section is quoted. It sas written by a student of his in Sociology 1 and he was impressed with its quality and thought I would be interested in it. I ends as follows:

> Consciousness-raising is vital to the liberation of women. The active search for identity, the development of talents and the opinions of men, insecurity and possessiveness vanish with the realization that no situation or relationship is ever really secure. Dependency and fear of loneliness vanish with the confrontation of one's ultimate aloneness. It is an exciting and humanizing experience to discover myself as a human being rather than as a woman who lived vicariously through her man...Self-actualization is as imperative for women as it is for men so that love can exist between the sexes not out of need or fear but as a spontaneous and and freely given gift to allow lifelong growth and the intense and incredible joy in creativity that shouts "I am alive, I am alive!"

And to conclude here is a letter written to my fourteen year old daughter by her similarly aged friend in Berkeley, a letter light years away from anything I or my friends during adolescence would do:

> Hi Melinda, How are You? I am fine and healthy as usual.
> The other day I was riding my bike and five Black Dudes came up to me, and one pinched by but(sic). Well I got pretty mad, and so the next

stop I got off my bike and slugged really hard and he flinched and held his chest like he was dying and boy did my hand hurt, rather my fist. Then I kicked their (sic) Volkswagen and there is the biggest dent you ever did see. He said at the next stop sign not to touch his car because it was his private property, and I said not to touch my but (sic) because it waymmy private property. And then I called him a Mother Fucker and rode off into the Sunset soppy isn't it?

RIGHT ON!!

---

(1) The "iron cage" was Max Weber's metaphor for bureaucratised society

(2) Dennis Hall and I called this "The Castration of Sigmund Freud by Talcott Parsons" in an informal seminar on Freud given by Neil Smelser, Berkeley.

(3) I know too much history of science to automatically accept a theory or reject one simply because at a particular historical time it is considered true or untrue. On the other hand, considering myself a scholar with a committment to truth, I can not lightly dismiss the scholarly views. Since I was in a dilemma I knew others would be, since that is one thing we learned in the women's movement as I've mentioned before.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ash, Mildred
1969 Personal Communication.

Bart, Pauline
1970 "Mother Portnoy's Complaint." Transaction. (November-December) vol. 8, #12.

See also "Depression in Middle Aged Women." Some Sociocultural Factors, unpublished Dissertation, UCLA 1967, available through University Microfilms, Ann Arbor Michigan.

1971 "The Myth of a Value Free Psychotherapy." Mendell Bell and James Mau (ed.) in Sociology and the Future. New York: Russell Sage.

Bell, Wendell and James Mau
1971 Sociology and the Future. New York: Russell Sage.

Bernard, Jessie
1970 Letter to the American Sociologist. 5 (November): 374-375.

Broverman, Donald, Inge K. Brovermann, F. E. Clarkson, P. S. Rosenkrantz, S. F. Vogel
1970 "Sex-role Stereotypes and Clinical Judgements of Mental Health." Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology. vol. 34.

Davidson, Sarah
1970 "To treat a Disturbed Person, to Treat his Family." New York Times. August 16.

Devereax, G.
1950 "The Female Castration complex and its repercussions in modesty, appearance and courtship etiquette." American Imago 17-3-19.

Durkheim, Emile
1951 Suicide. Tans. John A. Spaulding and George Simpson, Glencoe: Free Press.

Ellison, Ralph
1954 Shadow and Act. New York: Random House.

Flarsheim, Alfred
1971 "The Relationship between Woman's Sexual and Maternal Functions," paper presented at a conference on "The Psychodynamic Implications of the Physiological Studies in Sexuality." Eastern Penn. Psychiatric Institute.

Friedan, Betty
1963 The Feminine Mystique. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.

Glenn, N. D., and D. Weiner
1969 "Women trends in the Social Origins of American Sociololists," American Sociologist 5 (November): 291-3-2.

Gover, Robert
1951 One Hundred Dollar Misunderstanding. New York: Ballantine.

Haas, Mary
1964 "Men's and Women's Speech in Koasati in Language in Culture and Society. P-228-233. Dell Hymes (ed.) New York: Harper & Row

Hacker, Helen
1951 "Women as a Minority Group." Social Forces 30 (October) 60-69.

Hochscholde, Arlie
1970 "Another Idol of Social Science." Tans-action Nov. Dec., vol. 8, #12.

Horner, Matina
1969 "Fail! Bright Women." Psychology Today 3 (Nov.) pp. 36-41.

Hughes, Everett C.
1945 "Dilemma and Contradicition of Status." American Journal of Sociology 50 p-353-359.

Kanowitz, Leo
1959 Women and the Law. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.

Kinsey, Alfred C.
1953 Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: Saunder W. Co..

Linsky, Arnold
1969 "Community Structure and Depressive Disorder." Social Problems. Vol. 17 (summer) pp. 120-131.

Linton, Ralph
1945 The Cultural Background of Personality. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Long, Judith Laws
1971 Testimony to the Congress of the U.S. on the Equal Rights Amendment.

Maccoby, Eleanor
1966 The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford Press.

Macloed, Jennifer
1970 "How to Hold a Wife: A Bridegroom's Guide." Village Voice (February).

Mannheim, Karl
1959 "On generations." pp. 276-321 in Paul Kecskemeti (ed.) Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Martindale Don
1960 Nature and Types of Sociological Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Marx, Karl
k904 A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. Chicago: C. H. Kerr.

Masters, Williams H. and Virginia E. Johnson
1966 Human Sexual Response. Boston: Little, Brown.

Matza, David
1970 "Rebellious Youth." Unpublished paper.

Mills, C. Wright
1959 The Sociological Imagination. New York: Grove Press.

Muslin, Hymen L.
1971 "The Superego in Women." A Bulletin of the International Universities Press. (fall)

Patterson, Michelle
1971 "Alice in Wonderland: Women in Sociology." American Sociologist, forth coming.

Radical Therapist
1970

Reiff, Phillip
1959 Freud, the Mind of the Moralist. New York: Viking

Rossi, Alice
1964 "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal." Daedalus. 93, 2 (Spring) pp. 607-652.

1968 "Transition to Parenthood." Journal of Marriage and the Family. (February): 26-39.

1969 "Beginning of Ideology." The Humanist (fall).

RESEARCH IN PSYCHOLOGY RELEVANT TO THE SITUATION OF WOMEN

Grace Baruch

In surveying psychological data relevant to the situation of women, it is useful to look not only at studies intended to deal with women but also at those designed for other purposes. This point can be illustrated with reference to recent work on the effect upon boys of the father's absence or presence. Lyn Carlsmith reported (1964) that boys whose fathers were absent during their early years later showed a "feminine" abilities pattern in their Scholastic Aptitude Scores; their verbal abilities were higher and their mathematical abilities lower than those of comparable father-present boys. In comparing not only father-absent but low father-available boys with those whose fathers interacted with them at least two hours a day, Blanchard and Biller (1971) found that high-father-available boys performed better on achievement tests than did the other groups, even though IQ's were equated. One could interpret the results to mean that fathers who are not deeply involved with their sons may be in some sense damaging their intellectual growth. Even if the findings cannot be generalized to include female children, they still seem relevant to discussions of what the father's role should be, which in turn bears upon the issue of maternal employment.

In several of the six areas of research I shall discuss, comparable data exist that have not been examined for their importance to women.

Self-Esteem: Women's Status and Women's Self-Evaluations.

In general, self-esteem and being feminine do not go together. For women, of course, lack of femininity and self-esteem do not go together either. Some background and perspective on this double bind situation may be found in Coopersmith's (1968) study, The Antecedents of Self-Esteem, even though it focused upon pre-adolescent males. Self-esteem is defined as an attitude to the self, centering on the evaluative dimension. People tend to use four major bases for their self-evaluations: competence, virtue (a sense of being good or moral), power and influence over others, and degree of affection and acceptance from others. These may conflict with one another -- for example, power and affection -- and for women there are clearly such conflicts. Furthermore, women tend not to feel very competent, especially when they compare themselves with men.

Abundant evidence is available concerning these points. First, although males and females do not usually differ in self-esteem scores, femininity as measured by tests does show a negative correlation with self-esteem, for boys (Sears, 1970) as well as for girls (Connell & Johnson, 1971). Second, while self-esteem in boys is associated with such logically related traits as masculinity (Connell & Johnson, 1971), strong identification with the father (Gray, 1959), and resistance to persuasion (Hovland & Janis, 1959), these relationships do not hold for women and in fact are frequently reversed.

These puzzling findings can be somewhat clarified if one perceives inconsistency between the traditional feminine role and the competence and power bases of self-esteem. Jerome Kagan (1964) has pointed out that traits of competitiveness and aggressiveness are contra-indicated by the feminine sex role standard, while the prescribed traits -- conformity, dependence, passivity, nurturance -- require feedback from others. It is therefore extremely interesting that Coopersmith (1968) found that parents of low self-esteem boys valued traits related to gaining approval and affection from others, while parents of high self-esteem boys valued traits related to competence and achievement. It is clear that the traditional socialization of girls resembles that of low self-esteem boys.

I am presently studying the relationship of maternal employment to self-esteem in young women. Coopersmith found a positive relationship between lengthy maternal employment and self-esteem in his male subjects. I expected that, because women with employed mothers tend to see women as competent, as will be discussed below, their self-esteem would be higher. I am finding, however, that while daughters of employed women are in the middle range of self-esteem scores, those subjects with non-working mothers usually have considerably higher or lower scores. It seems likely that the satisfaction women obtain in their pattern is more relvant to their own and their daughters' self-esteem than is the nature of the pattern. Women who occupy the traditional role pattern may be either satisfied or unhappy, and ramifications of these feelings may be the crucial determinants of their own and their daughters' self-evaluations. Employed women may not originate among those highest in self-esteem and able to adjust to the traditional feminine role, yet their work may prevent them from being very low in self-evaluations, perhaps because their sense of competence is helped through work. Women in general, however, do not evaluate their own competence highly.

Many studies have shown that women evaluate their own sex and traits associated with it lower than the male sex and "masculine" traits (McKee & Sherrifs, 1957). They associate competence and related traits with masculinity (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968), and they evaluate professional articles ascribed to males higher than identical articles ascribed to females (Goldberg, 1967). It is interesting that these effects are not found in women whose mothers are employed (Baruch, 1971; Vogel, Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1971). Women find male instructors to be more convincing (Bernard, 1966) and prefer to be taught by them (Baruch, 1971). Many more women than men prefer to be of the opposite sex (Brown, 1957).

Girls whose abilities are equal to boys nevertheless see themselves as less able to do college work and believe their class rank to be lower (Wylie, 1963). Women athletes whose ability is the same as men's rate themselves lower (Clifton & Smith, 1963). Feeling inferior in competence must in some way be damaging to self-esteem, yet feeling too competent may imply lack of femininity and hence also lower self-esteem.

Achievement and Women:

The need to feel feminine and the desire to feel accepted by others apparently has a negative effect upon achievement motivation and upon actual accomplishment. The prohibition of competition and aggression by the feminine sex-role standard must inhibit in women traits necessary for successful achievement. It is interesting that traits associated with the opposite sex apparently foster creativity in both men and women; for example, creativity in males is related to passivity and openness to feelings. Eleanor Maccoby, who has pointed this out (1966), suggests that, because of this curvilinear relationship between creativity and resemblence to one's sex role standard; neither extremely feminine nor extremely masculine behavior should be seen as ideal, or else males will be too aggressive and females too dependent for the highest creative achievements.

To achieve more, women apparently need to be less traditionally feminine. In both sexes, measured femininity is associated with the failure of IQ's to increase with age (Kagan & Moss, 1962). Bradway and Thompson (1962) found that women's IQ's, unlike men's, did not increase with age. Women's motivation to achieve is frequently weakened by anxiety, as Matina Horner (1970) has shown. Investigators working in the field of achievement motivation had found it difficult to arouse women's need to achieve by the means successful with male subjects -- for example, informing them they had just done poorly on an intelligence test. Only threats to their social (popularity) status had the desired effect. Horner found that the underlying problem was a fear of the negative consequences, especially social rejection, that many able women believed would accompany successful achievement. This "motive to avoid success" is associated with actual lowered performance on competitive tasks, and, I would assume, in any situation the woman defines as competitive. While Horner has stressed the importance of attitudes of significant men in affecting women's own attitudes, I would guess that the role of the mother is of at least equal importance. For example, a working mother who leads a satisfying life may serve as a powerful example that femininity and competence are not incompatible.

However, before dismissing as foolish women's tendencies to avoid aggressiveness and competition, one ought to be aware of a warning note sounded by Konrad Lorenz. He observed that abasement behavior in the female -- for example, among many birds -- is linked to male redirection of aggression away from females (Tanner & Inhelder, 1958). A bird's behavior toward any other bird, male or female, is determined by the status of the other bird. A higher-status bird is always shown female behavior, and a lower status bird is shown male behavior. The implication Lorenz finds is that male aggressiveness may no longer be deflected from females who give up abasement behavior and show aggressiveness.

Prejudice:

The feminine non-aggressive behavior just described may have some relationship to a phenomenon frequently described by such students of prejudice as Allport (1958): the tendency of members of outgroups and victims of prejudice to turn their anger against themselves and their own group. Moreover, studies

of the behavior of concentration camp inmates indicate that victims tend to identify with the aggressors, to take them as models and incorporate their attitudes and values. This represents a form of self-defense, an attempt to reduce feelings of danger, powerlessness, and inferiority. Adopting the beliefs and prejudices of the dominant group is often accompanied by denial of membership in the out-group. While it is questionable whether women constitute a true minority group, career women have occupied such a position, and other women do tend to deny their own career interests and join in condemnations. A study by Hardt (1958) showed that when two women were described identically but one was presented as a career woman, she received a much more negative evaluation. Goldberg (1967) found that women were more prejudiced against women's work than were comparable males.

Helen Hacker (1951) has pointed out that, even if women do not believe themselves to be a minority group, they show classical signs of such a group in their use of defenses such as those described. For example, a belief that any job discrimination is warranted is commonly found among women, who justify their attitudes with a recital of negative traits of women, such as leaving jobs to marry, absenteeism, etc. These psychological mechanisms are harmful, in that they lessen the likelihood that equal rights will be sought and that women will unite (Keniston & Keniston, 1964).

Maternal Employment:

The woman who works when she could be performing a solely domestic, child-rearing role is usually negatively evaluated by society. A flurry of research a decade ago attempted to assess the validity of the belief that children were damaged if their mothers worked (Harteley, 1962; Nye & Hoffman, 1963). Expected tendencies to delinquency and sex role confusion were not found, while hints that there were positive effects were ignored.

A major reason for this negative approach was the publicity given to a group of psychanalytically oriented investigations, which not only often used poor methodology but were generalized beyond any justified application. (Incidentally, while the condemnation of working mothers is often blamed upon psychoanalysis, it might more logically be blamed upon Victorian biases about working women, which are prominent in Freud's letters to his fiancee. Keniston and Keniston (1964) point out that work was associated with promiscuity and aggressiveness and signified the inability of a father or husband to support his women. Yet nursemaids were common in middle-class households. The leap from the idea that women ought not to work to the belief that children need contact with their mothers and that substitutes are harmful is mysterious.)

All this does not mean, however, that no variations in development and in personality will result from new forms of child care arrangements. It does mean that no damage or deprivation need be involved.

Finally, there are positive effects of material employment that have been overloooked. These have been suggested above and can be summarized as follows:

1. Women with employed mothers associate competence with femininity as well as masculinity (Vogel, et. al., 1971) and do not devalue the professional work of women compared with men (Baruch, 1971).

2. Such women are more likely to complete their education, especially at such levels as medical school (Lopate, 1968).

3. Better mother-daughter relationships have been found in families where the mother is employed (Winter, 1971).

4. Only girls whose mother is employed believe their fathers might choose to adopt a girl rather than a boy (Hartley, 1962), a belief that may reflect higher self-esteem. (As mentioned above, boys whose mothers have worked for long periods tend to have higher self-esteem, and Hartley (1962) reports they are more interested in getting married.)

5. Girls with employed mothers are more likely to name the mother as their model (Douvan, 1963), and are more likely to desire a life pattern like their mother's rather than their father's (Baruch, 1971). Many different studies have shown a rather startling tendency on the part of girls to identify with their fathers, and it seems logical that factors increasing the tendency to identify with the mother have a positive effect upon development.

Identification:

Studies of identification suggest that the traditional feminine sex role has had negative as well as positive effects upon development. (Measures used in such studies, which may be called tests of "femininity," "maternal identification," etc. are frequently inconsistent with each other. Identification may be operationally defined as actual similarity to a parent, as similarity perceived by the subject, or by attachment strength. Femininity merely means resemblance to other women, thus perpetuating the traditional concept, especially since items which do not discriminate between the sexes are eliminated during test construction.) The concept of identification refers to the tendency to take another as a model, and thus involves imitation, feelings of attachment, and perception of the self as resembling the model. The value of a strong identification with the parent of the same sex is stressed both in Freudian theory, as a way of resolving Oedipal conflicts and establishing a conscience, and in role theory, as a means of learning one's sexual and social role. Whatever the theory, empirical findings have been puzzling. For male subjects, results indicate that identification with the father is related to other positive traits -- self-esteem, adjustment, masculinity -- while for females those traits expected to be correlated with maternal identification are not found or are inversely correlated (Gray & Klaus, 1956; Heilbrun, 1969; Kohlberg, 1966).

An especially disturbing finding is the correlation of femininity in girls with identification with the father. Heilbrun (1969) has argued that the father may be responsible for sex typing in both sexes; however, it seems more reasonable to make the interpretation that many "normal" girls see negative aspects in the feminine role and hence reject the mother as a model. (What such girls are like may be seen in Heilbrun's finding that girls labeled by tests as "masculine" do not lack feminine traits but rather possess in

addition those traits related to an instrumental orientation.) It is relevant that ideal womanhood in the eyes of clinicians, as measured by the personality traits therapists desire for their female patients, can be described as child-like and amorphous (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1969). To some degree one can compare any preferences of females for what is masculine to the finding so frequent in the past that black children prefer what is white. The status and power inherent in a role clearly influence its attractiveness, as do the satisfactions it offers. Roger Brown (1965) has pointed out that it is because the male role is superior that so much more horror is felt at male homosexuality than at female. Because the male is demeaning himself, he is seen as very disturbed indeed.

For all the reasons given above, I expected that maternal employment would improve the attractiveness of the maternal model and the feminine role and compared identification in college women whose mothers were and were not employed. I found that those with working mothers did more often choose to identify with her, but this was apparently because of the greater satisfaction obtained by the employed mothers, not because their daughters had higher evaluations of feminine competence. It was interesting, however, that career-oriented subjects tended to identify with their fathers, even if their mothers worked, perhaps because the career experiences of their fathers were more appealing than those of their mothers. It is even more interesting that in every grouping of subjects, the proportion choosing the father for identification was very high, never less than half. Obviously traditional theories of development must take into consideration social factors if they are not to end up incorrectly labeling most people as disturbed.

Freudian Theory and Its Critics:

As a major theory of feminine development, Freudian theory has had an impact through the popular and "high" cultures as well as through therapy. Overall, the view of women must be called negative:

1. Women are seen as having more difficult development than the male; they must transfer their love from the mother to the father and their libidinal focus from the clitoris to the vagina. These complications mean they often fail to develop properly and in any case tend to be rigid and lack the energy necessary for later achievement.

2. Because girls are not threatened by castration feelings after they develop Oedipal feelings, they lack motivation to resolve their Oedipal conflicts and identify with the mother. Thus they show lesser conscience development and independence.

3. Women suppress aggression, whether for biological or social reasons. They turn aggression against themselves and therefore are masochistic; narcissism is increased both to compensate for this and for their feeling of physical inferiority.

4. Girls feel inferior to boys because they lack a penis; this feeling frequently causes them to protest their femininity and seek masculine activities throughout their lives, causing disturbed relationships and frustration.

Past criticisms of Freudian theory have usually stressed social factors as a cause of women's difficulties and inferior status. However, recent research in many fields has posed perhaps more basic challenges to the theory. For example:

1. Males too must be seen as having special difficulties in their development, for the primary identification of children of both sexes is with the mother. Boys must overcome this, and this is made harder where boys are surrounded by female influences in their early years.

2. The motive to become more and more competent and effective with respect to one's environment is a basic human endowment (White, 1959); such motivation and ensuing activities in women cannot be viewed as a sign of disturbance or faculty development.

3. New knowledge about gender identity reveals the crucial influence of the parents in determining sex role aspects of personality (Stoller, 1968).

Penis envy is, apparently, a common phenomenon in young girls; attempts to deny this are in error. However, it may be strengthened and caused to persist into adult life by social factors upholding male superiority. For example, in a society supporting primogeniture, the sibling rivalty of children would not be expected to decrease and would greatly influence adult personality. Thus adult women's envy of men and the developmental stage of penis envy need not be of identical origin and structure. In addition, part of the problem of the young girl frequently is her parents' failure to make clear the feminine reproductive system, so that the sense of being without a sex organ is unnecessarily strong. (This situation, as well as the intricacies of arguments about whether feminine sexuality is primary or secondary and about the role of the clitoris as described by Masters and Johnson are discussed by Sherfey (1968) in a psychoanalytic context.)

As evidence accumulates to correct Freudian theory and other erroneous data about women, it is important to note Gregory Zilboorg's (1944) point that the central question is why so many errors have been made for so long. Zilboorg answers that in pre-history males felt envy, aggression, guilt, and subsequent prejudice toward women. More generally, if one remains aware of the likelihood of being blinded by biases, a fresh look at a wide variety of psychological literature will provide new material of great importance that will aid in the planning and interpretation of future work.

References

Stoller, R. Sex and Gender. New York: Science House, 1968.

Tanner, J., & Inhelder, B. (Eds.), Discussions on Child Development. Vol. 3. New York: International Universitites Press, 1958.

Vogel, S. R., Btoverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F., & Rosendrantz, P. Maternal employment and perceptions of sex-role stereotypes. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 384-391.

White, R. Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 297-333.

Winter, A. Personal communication, 1971.

Wylie, R. C. Children's estimates of their schoolwork ability as a function of sex, race, and socioeconomic level. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 203-224.

Zilboorg, G. Masculine and feminine. Psychiatry, 1944, 7, 257-296.

WOMEN AND THE VISUAL ARTS

Gretel Chapman

I will address myself particularly to the question of curriculum. I feel that women's studies must include, as an essential aspect of our cultural and intellectual history, an investigation of the visual tradition. To consider the negative aspects first: women form concepts of themselves largely on the basis of what images are available to them in the popular culture in which they live. The images of women which have been most consistently projected in Western European culture are reflections of male conceptions, preoccupations, fears, and fantasies. This can be ascertained by a study of the visual tradition, focussing on the depiction of women as seen in portraiture and genre scenes, for example, on the allegorical significance of women (especially where the connatations are negative, as in most erotic art), or on certain themes, such as the Fall of Man, or the many and various renditions of such polar images as Eve and Mary, etc. In no case, to my knowledge, has there ever been a portrayal of the woman as a self-determining, independent, creative, self-assertive individual. Women should be made aware of this distorted image of themselves in order to deal with it critically and intelligently.

The more positive aspect of the problem of curriculum is, however, my main focus here. It seems to me that there are a number of ways in which a truer perspective of ourselves, and hence, of humanity, might be arrived at. I suggest them briefly as follows:

1. A reassessment should be made of women artists today and in the past, so that their cultural and aesthetic significance can be considered in <u>human</u> terms rather than in <u>male</u> terms.

2. Studies should be begun of the role of sex differences (which are culturally determined) in questions of taste. Do women consistently have certain kinds of esthetic preferences? One way to approach this question might be to investigate the nature of the works of art bought or commissioned by women, and to study the role of women as patrons of the arts.

3. Studies should be begun of the social acceptance of and esteem for contemporary women artists in comparison with their male colleagues. (Ms. Margaret Klitzke, undergraduate at Goucher College, intends to carry out such a study).

4. Studies should be begun of cultures in which all forms of art are produced primarily by women, or androgynously, i.e., by both sexes. I think we would find that our concepts of artisitc creativity as limited to the male sex will appear to be extremely culture-bound.

5. We should begin to make analyses of the use of sex terms in

art theory and criticism. What is meant, for example, by a "masculine" art? A "feminist period"?

It is obvious that few of these studies will fit into the present fossilized art historical curriculum, which is limited to study of the art of a particular, arbitrarily delimited, period of time. What is imperative, then, if any new insights are to ensue from women's studies in the visual arts, is a complete transormation and revitalization of the curriculum, so that topical courses, such as The History of Art Patronage, Problems in Art Theory and Criticism, Concepts of Creativity, etc., might be offered, as well as direct studies such as Women Artists in the Western European Tradition, etc.

THE WOMAN IN THE MOON: TOWARDS AN INTEGRATION OF WOMEN'S STUDIES

Devra Lee Davis

"Quod est ergo tempus? Si nemo ex me quaerat scio. Si quaerenti explicare velim, nescio." In this manner, Augistine pointed out the nature of everyday assumptions. "What therefore is time? If no one asks me, I know. If I am asked to explain, I do not know." Part of the difficulty for a student of women's studies comes from a comparable problem. As soon as an explanation of women's studies is attempted many of the everyday taken for granted assumptions become apparent. The feelings and convictions of scholars may be as unarticulated about women's studies as they are about the nature of time. In fact, women's studies presently comprises a sort of Cook's tour of women in society, literature, art, political economy, and various other academic disciplines. A paraphrase of Russell's dictum about philosophy rings uncomfortably true: women's studies is what women's studies students do.

Part of the problems of the field is the relatively new academic status of women's studies. Within the past few years, some universities are reluctantly legitimating women's studies. Often the overriding feeling is that it is necessary to include women as a special academic topic, since other special interest groups are so designated within academic institutions. The recent fade outs of some of these academic programs for special interest groups augurs poorly for women's studies programs. Women's studies must either profit from their failures or follow a similar pattern to indifference. While financial crises of academia partially account for the phasing out of Black Studies at Yale University and Cornell University, they may not be the most important factor.

A more pressing problem for area studies of special groups is the need for a unifying framework. Without such a basis, women's studies becomes just another scholarly potpourri of occasionally infuriating trivia. Of course women's studies reflects the women's movement which is itself very diverse, spanning a continum marked at one end by the National Organization of Women and marked at the other end by the radical feminists and radical lesbians. Both for the development of a broad movement and for the integration of numerous disciplines, it is strategically prudent not to write out any views of women, by systematizing women's studies in a doctrinnaire manner. As Shulamith Firestone noted in The Dialectic of Sex, (1970, 1) "sex class is so deep as to be invisible." An important first step for women's studies then is to make the sex class system visible to all its participants, female and male.

Toward this end of visibility of the sex class system, women's studies can now make progress. Until very recently there were relatively few classical analyses of women's studies. Charlotte Bilman Perkins provocative analysis of Women and Economics, 1898, stands almost alone as an economic history of women. Recent publications in the disciplines of psychology, political economy, sociology and literature are rapidly filling the academic void as are the new academic programs. But all of these studies require a unifying matrix for integrating them both with the

disciplines from which they initially derive and with other disciplinary studies of women.

One way that the diverse disciplines comprising women's studies can establish a common grounding is to demand that the studies demonstrate more than the uniqueness of the women or events that they discuss. Women's studies have an especial obligation to indicate the role of socio-cultural mechanisms. This demand that women's studies look especially for systematic social influences harks back to a nineteenth centur controversy about the nature of social inquiry. The nub of the controversy was whether a scientific social inquiry was possible. Some argued the nomothetical view that social inquiry yielded lawlike statements, literally nomo thesis. Others argued the ideographic view that social inquiry yielded only unique characterizations of particular events at particular times. Neither of these views of social inquiry excludes the other: the unique nature of each human act does not vitiate the overall patterns which these cumulative acts present.

A better appreciation of the importance of nomothetic analyses in women's studies can be gained from thinking of the standard debates concerning the absence of women geniuses, artists, etc. One side argues that women have been traditionally oppressed, undereducated and restricted to childbreeding; thus the few women who have transcended these traditional roles had different socialization experiences. Another side asks about the physico-chemical bases for women's roles in society which are analogous to the roles of females of other species. According to this view those few women who excel are statistical deviations from the normal women's roles, which are naturally or viologically determined.

Whatever clarifications are developed about this question of the dearth of outstanding women intellects--and the likely direction of these clarifications is not yet so apparent--one thing is clear about the kinds of evidence which will be of value: evidence on a socio-cultural level which looks for larger patterns. Of course, the intricacies of Germaine de Stael's publishing and translating of Kantian works are important for an understanding of the dissemination of Kantian philosophy in France in the early nineteenth century. But these intricacies are primarily of interest to women's studies insofar as they constitute part of a larger class of behaviours which other women of comparable like have endured.

> Our history has been stolen from us. Our heroes died in childbirth, from peritonitis, overwork, oppression, from bottled up rage. Our geniuses were never taught to read or write. We must invent a past adequate to our ambitions. We must create a future adequate to our needs. (Women, Journal of Liberation, Spring, 1970)

This is an anguished apologia to historiography for the dearth of women giants on whose shoulders women might stand (to extend Isaac Newton's immodest claim that if he had seen further, it was because he had stood on the shoulders of giants who had preceeded him). Such an apologia assumes that women's history has been stolen and that there is consequently a need to invent a history in order to justify ambitions of women who presently wish to break out of traditional, historical female roles.

To be sure "normal" history[1] lacks many significant women figures because women have been oppressed, Yet history does not merely need to be invented on that account. Rather it needs to be discovered and interpreted from a new perspective which fully considers the extent of women's oppression. And the search for historical women giants need not be so desperate, once two related factors are noted. First of all like all science history follows basic paradigms or styles of analysis (Kuhn, Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 1962, 1970, 19-20). While paradigms generally refer to the history of the sciences, there is no reason not to apply the concept to the history of history as well. In fact the notion of the paradigm seems peculiarly suited to the study of women in history: "like an accepted judicial decision in the common law, it is an object for further articulation and specification under new or more stringent conditions." (Kuhn, 1970, 23). In both the sciences and history once a paradigm becomes the basis for research-- "like an accepted judicial decision in the common law"-- it serves to organize and interpret subsequent investigations.

The intrinsically tautological nature of a paradign is conceded by its originator, Kuhn: "a paradigm is what the members of a scientific community share, and conversely, a scientific community consists of men (sic) who share a paradigm" (Kuhn, 1970, 176). By introducing Kuhn's conceptualizations of paradigm here, it is assumed that historians constitute a scientific community, communicate with one another, and generally act like other members of different scientific communities. Should any of these assumptions prove false, it might do well to rely on the heuristic qualification that concern here is with the development of analogies rather than with an approach to absolute truth. "The demand that effort should be concentrated on attempts to falsify a theory is replaced, on the view that theories are analogies, by the demand that the analogy should be extended if possible and delineated." (Tricker, The Assessment of Scientific Speculation, 1965, 188). Thus even if historians do not in fact constitute a bona fide scientific community and even if they do not use a special paradigm, the analysis of historiography in terms of paradigm can continue, so long as the analogy works--that is, so long as it is useful to think of history in terms of paradigm.

The insignificance of women as intellects and as forces in history may be regarded as part of a historical paradigm based on normal historical research. Historians have generally noted that women are not significant intellectual figures or forces in history (a corollary part of this paradigm is the emphasis on women's ascribed statuses and the disinterest in women's achieved statuses). Given the previously mentioned circular nature of scientific paradigms it is possible to appreciate the dearth of women giants in history as well as the related paucity of analyses of women as forces in history. Insofar as historians as a community share a modus operandi or paradigm, their paradigm regards women as insignificant. In some sense, then, to be a historian is to share this paradigm. Robert K. Merton has observed that this paradigm of women in history retrodicts the self-fulfilling prophecy. To wit, are women insignificant in history, because they are paradigmatically percieved as insignificant; or are women paradigmatically percieved as insignificant because they are in fact insignificant? Of course it is impossible to resolve this dilemma when put in

this fashion. The more important point is that the dilemma persists.

The self-perpetuating persistence of paradigms relates to a second order explanation of the dearth of women giants: namely, the basic historical paradigm of women's insignificance makes it easy to overlook those women who do not conform to the paradigm; and paradoxically it makes those who deviate from the paradigm visible in peculiar ways. In effect those who deviate reinforce the paradigm, much as deviance in society serves to define what is normal. Paradigms are not pronunciamento ex cathedra; they derive from cumulated, shared research of a scientific community (Kuhn, 1970); and they point out problem areas for subsequent analysis. "Inevitably they restrict the phenomenlogical field accessible for scientific investigation at any given time." (Kuhn, 1970, 60).

There is thus resistance to changing paradigms: facts which do not fit a paradigm tend to be lost easily or explained away. The profound pessimism confronting scientific revolutions is well known now. What is less well known is that even within normal science, unexpected facts are easily lost. For instance, evidence for the existence of the planet Neptune was actually observed as early as 1690 by Flamsteed. Yet not until 1781 did William Herschel suggest the possibility that the planet Neptune occupied a planetary orbit beyond Uranus. "After its discovery it was later found to have been observed at least twenty times before, but it had been mistaken for a star." (Tricker, 1965, 50-51).

In order to begin discovering women's history as a lawlike nomothetic process, it is necessary that individually significant figures be viewed from a larger socio-cultural perspective. The study of women has to avoid the pitfall of seeing stars where a series of planets can be discerned, and losing the masses in starlight. Unless interest in significant women figures is couched in a larger perspective, this interest can be detrimental to a systematic appraisal of women in history.

It is time to stop looking for the gloriously unique in women as a defensive reaction to accusations of women's inferiority. Now is the time to start looking; or the gloriously common, for that which unites women as parts of history. The search for the unusual and the special can easily become just one more form of cooptation. Consistent with the normal paradigm of women's insignificance in history, individual women who excel are freaks. Blinded to their socio-cultural role, normal historians see these women as magical creatures whenever they occur outside their traditional roles. Normal historians need a new vision.

Many people have seen the man in the moon. But have you ever seen the woman in the moon? Of course only those with eyes to see her would see her. Persons generally see the man in the moon in the configuration of markings on the moon's face or on its profile at quarter moon. From a different perspective the woman on the moon is visible. Like all other human activity seeing requires learning. If this seems absurd, imagine how the blind see space. "The ideas of space possessed by the blind differ in character from those of the sighted." Tricker, 1965, 121). Once they acquire vision, however, the formerly blind learn to see as the sighted do.

At first it seems outlandish and preposterous to make an analogy between the blind and the sighted and normal historians and new historians of women. Yet there is a sense in which normal historians see a different reality than new historians. And new historians may be able to give normal historians a new vision. Now is a time for seemingly outlandish and preposterous analogies. If the future history of women happens to turn out to be different from the past history of women, if only in a limited way, it is better to adopt the principle that it is. And if it turns out not to be so, it may sill be better for having made that assumption; and it will certainly be no worse.

---

(1) In this essay "normal History" means research based upon past acknowledged foundations of historical inquiry. Vide, Kuhn, 1970, 10.

THE SEXIST IMAGE OF WOMEN IN LITERATURE

Mary Anne Ferguson

The course I am teaching at the University of Massachusetts is called The Image of Women in Literature; by adding the adjective "sexist" to the title for this lecture, I was not trying to be sensational but merely attempting to limit the topic. Many portraits of women in literature cannot be called sexist -- a term which I will define shortly; one thinks immediately of characters in Chaucer, Shakespeare, Henry James, Ibsen, Checkhov. Nor is the seixst image the vision of male authors only; Jane Austen, Willa Cather, even George Eliot present women as feminine stereotypes. Discussing the image of women in literature involves one in questions of the relation of art to reality, of the significance of genre and mode such as comedy and tragedy for interpretation, of the shaping force of literary tradition. By discussing only the sexist image, I hope to show how a feminist approach to literature can throw light on larger problems of values in literature.

In her book Thinking about Women Mary Ellman has described the stereotypes of women which literature presents. Women have been considered, first of all, to be formless; their minds, like their bodies, are thought of as soft, incapable of coherent thought and speech, but adequate to follow routines. Women have been labelled passive; they are, like Nature itself, waiting to be conquered by men. When aroused from this natural passivity, women are seen as unstable, unpredictable, hysterical; these characteristics are seen to be natural, innate. Since women are incapable of understanding abstractions, they are thought to be practical, materialistic. They are likely to be pious, but only in observing rituals; they are not capable of inventing religions or philosophical systems. As long as they remain virgin, they are thought to be pure and spiritual; once deflowered, they quite properly turn from heavenly contemplation and dedicate themselves to serving their husbands, in a wife, passivity and practicality become virtues.

These contradictory characteristics reflect age-old ambivalence about women; they are damned if they do and damned if they don't. Throughout Western literature these and other characteristics connected with them -- talkativeness, nagging, deceitfulness, pettiness, lust -- have been clustered around characters taken by readers to reflect reality. These stereotypes also create reality by serving as models of what real women should become. Especially in the 20th century, the images of our most "serious," avant-garde literature filter down into popular art with very little cultural lag; they pervade children's literature, are exploited by the media, and help to shape reality.

One common aspect of almost all the stereotypes is that women are seen primarily in their relationships to men, to such an extent that these relationships define women. Behind most of the stereotypes, as Ellman points out, is the persistent association of men with art, women with nature. Men are capable of making something of themselves, of their experience, of nature; like Pygmalion, they may even create a woman. But women remain defined by their natural roles; they are presented as wives, mistresses, mothers, daughters.

Men of course have natural roles; but in literature they are seldom defined by them. In Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, for example, the Knight is presented in terms of what he as a knight, has done; it is mentioned that he is the father of the Squire but nothing is made of this point. The Wife of Bath, on the other hand, though she is a member of a guild of skilled workers, is never shown at work, even in her own narration of her life story; she is characterized almost entirely in terms of her role as the dominating wife of five men.

We might define the sexist image of women in literature as this portrayal of women in their biological roles. According to the sexist view, for women and only for women anatomy is destiny. When women sin, it is seldom because of the truly human fault of pride or hubris; their sins are almost entirely against chastity -- so much so that the very word virtue, derived from the Latin word vir meaning man -- has come to mean the particular goodness of women, that is chastity. Long before Kate Millett pointed out the patriarchal structure of Western society, Dr. Samuel Johnson observed that "The chastity of women is of the utmost importance, as all property depends upon it." In a book called Pamela's Daughters, Utter and Needham have shown that chastity viewed as a commodity has been one of the main themes of the novel since the 18th century. Since until very recently women have in real life been regarded as chattels, without rights to their own bodies or to their children, it is not surprising to find that in literature they are seldom seen as fully human beings, the equals of men. Rather, the sexist view shows women as either inferior or superior to men. Because they are childlike, silly -- like Ibsen's Nora -- they are seen as rightfully in need of masculine guidance and control, rightfully kept in their place. Paradoxically, because they are also seen as too good to be true -- as the guardians of morality and society, as the inspiration and salvation of men -- they are likewise kept in their place. The kitchen and the pedestal serve equally to isolate women from men; only in the bedroom do they share fully in human life. Women who object to this limitation are seen as aggressive, irrational, perverse, the discontentment of the upper middle-class woman idolized by her husband elicited from Freud the petulant question, "What do women want?"

In literature there have been many variations of the sexist image of women. One of the most persistent has been that of the submissive wife who not only knows her place but is happy in it, with the result that everyone around her is happy too. The classic image of this ray of sunshine is that of the Patient Griselda, a legendary figure written about during the Middle Ages by Boccaccio, Petrarch, and Chaucer, Griselda, the daughter of a serf -- dressed in rags but very beautiful -- is overwhelmed at the honor done to her when Count Walter asks her to marry him. She happily promises to obey him absolutely, delighted, even awed, by his condescension in raising her to the status of his wife. Later, even when Walter commands her to give him their children to be killed and, after he has put her aside, to become a servant for his new wife, she obeys without question and, according to the story, without reservation. Chaucer's celibate clerk who tells the tale and his male audience find in Griselda their ideal; they bemoan the fact that the good old days are gone and there are no more Griseldas around. Even though it is obvious to them that there are no real women like Griselda, they hold her up as a model of what women ought to be, indeed of what all humanity ought to be in relation to God. Not only as analogous to cosmic order but also as a means of preserving

the social order, this image of the true woman as the docile subserviant wife has persisted to the present day.

Shakespeare added to its power by satirizing it in The Taming of the Shrew. Although no one seriously believes that the shrewish Kate has totally changed at the end of the play, her speech describing the ideal wife is the last word, part of the comic happy ending. Having won a bet for her husband by demonstrating her obedience, Kate recommends her behavior to less subservient wives, saying

> Thy husband is thy lord, thy life, thy keeper,
> Thy head, thy sovereign . . .
> Who craves no other tribute at thy hands
> But love, fair looks, and true obedience.

To rebel against one's husband, she says, is tantamount to commiting treason. Since they have soft bodies, women should be soft and yielding. The popularity of the modern version Kiss Me, Kate, is an indication of the persistence of this idea, however much it may be recognized as fantasy. Its prevalence in real life is exemplified in what Betty Friedan has labelled the "feminine mystique," the idea that by being secondary to and supportive of their husbands, women will find fulfillment. The recent bestseller and movie, Sue Kaufman's Dairy of a Mad Housewife, shows an educated wife so bored by domestic routine that she seeks escape through a dead-end love affair; but when she realizes that her boredom stems from her failure to understand her husband's problems and his need for her, she is reconverted to her role of faithful domesticity. Her insight about the naturalness of this role has come through psychoanalysis. Because of its role as the opiate of the housewife, Freudian psychoanalysis is under attack in real life; feminists view the end of The Diary of a Mad Housewife as a realistic description of Freudian "adjustment." In a recent popular English novel, Nina Bawden's A Woman of My Age, a middle-aged wife whose children have grown up and left, faces the sterility of her life by having an affair; but her escape is only temporary and she is happy at the end of the story because she is going to remain with her husband but bear her lover's child. Once again, anatomy is destiny -- and the only prescription for happiness.

Simone de Beauvoir has pointed out that modern Western man doesn't want a totally passive partner; he refers a struggle before domination, but "in his heart of hearts he wants this struggle to be a game for him, while for woman it involves her very destiny." Perhaps a recent statement by Norman Mailer represents the ultimate expression of what men want from women: Mailer deplores the use of contraceptives because it removes the risk of childbirth and death for the woman and so makes sex less exciting, less existential. The image of woman as willing sex object, the fantasy of pornography such as The Story of O as well as of such writers as Mailer, D. H. Lawrence, and Henry Miller, is but an extension of the Griselda fantasy. All three authors, as Kate Millett has shown, no matter how much they disguise their ideas in mysticism or doctrines of sex as salvation from society and nihilism, see women primarily as means of men's liberation. According to Norman Mailer, who asks a question almost as petulantly as Freud did -- "Who should wash the dishes?" -- the woman should, so that a man of genius will be free to give his all to the world. Similarly,

in Segal's Love Story, the heroine and her husband are equally sure that her fellowship to study music in Paris is secondary to his need to be independent of his father. Jenny's death at 25 serves to reconcile father and son -- a sacrifice which beatifies her. One wonders why Mailer's four ex-wives have not been willing to achieve similar exaltation.

The sexism of the Griselda image has been shown in some literature in its true light. Dorothy Parker in a short story called "Big Blonde" shows the pathos of a woman who spends her life as the "good sport," the complaisant drinking and sexual partner of a series of men, all of whom are repulsed when she reveals her true melancholy self. In Chekhov's short story "The Darling," a woman who finds her identity only through men is shown as stupid and silly. Olga's absurdity is revealed when she happily parrots the opinions of Husband No. 2 even though they are diametrically opposed to those of Husband No. 1 which she had previously parrotted. The full measure of her inferiority is shown when, widowed again, she repeats as her own the opinions of a schoolboy she is taking care of. But in spite of her shallowness, Olga elicits from the reader more pity than laughter. It is the townspeople whom Chekhov is satirizing; it is a society which calls her "the darling," which approves of her total submission, that Chekhov asks us to laugh at. One of the values of a feminist approach to literature is illustrated in this interpretation of the story. Critics including Tolstoi have interpreted it as a character study and miss its added dimension as social satire. Sometimes such a limited interpretation stems from the naive assumption that literary characters are like case histories; Olga's life story does read like the case history of a submissive wife, but understanding the significance of the title and the tone of the story prevent oversimplification and prohibit our seeing Chekhov as a misogynist.

The value of a feminist approach which sees the limitations of sexist stereotypes can be further illustrated in connection with a short story of Doris Lessing's entitled "To Room Nineteen." The protagonist Susan marries because it seems the thing to do, gladly giving up her job as a commercial artist to devote herself to husband, four children, big house. She deliberately plays the role of perfect wife, exulting even in doing all the housework herself. Susan thinks that once the children are "off her hands," she will be able to lead a life of her own; but when she is finally free from domestic duties, she finds she doesn't know what to do with her freedom. Even after she has rented a room in a hotel so that she can be completely away from any claims on her time and attention, all she can do five days a week is to sit in a chair or lie on a bed and idly daydream. She finally realizes that her role-playing as wife-mother-housekeeper has been so thorough that she has no other identity, and she commits suicide. Although her husband has not achieved perfect happiness by working in a fairly mundane and static job, he is saved by his contacts with other adults from insanity and suicide. The story shows that the role of submissive wife demands from women their identity as human beings and in extreme cases leads not only to a vague discontent -- Betty Friedan's "the problem that has no name" -- but to neurosis, psychosis, suicide. Yet readers without perspective on the pervasiveness of the stereotype on which Susan modeled her life, are likely to see her suicide as idiosyncratic, instead of as an aspect of the insanity of a sick society. Like Chekhov, Doris Lessing does not in this story or elsewhere demonstrate the peculiarities of women but the blindness of mankind, and the limitations of rational thought. Similarly, Flaubert in Madame Bovary is showing not merely the shallowness of a foolish woman but the falseness of an entire society which accepts the romantic view of woman and of life.

Along with the image of the ideal wife and sex object has gone that of the dominating woman, the aggressive, shrewish bitch who is a threat not only to a man's happiness but to his integrity and even his life. Chaucer's Wife of Bath is the medieval type of the bad wife because she dominates her husbands by being sexually insatiable, materialistic, selfish, deceitful; However much Chaucer lets the reader see the Wife as attractive because of her love of life, her vigor, her honesty, her self-knowledge, the other characters see her as the embodiment of everything a man would like to avoid. She needs to be tamed, like Shakespeare's Kate. Her modern descendants are legion: she is the wife of Walter Mitty, of Caper Milquetoast. Even in a comedy, like Thurber's story: she is seen as dangerous: by making her husband unmanly she diminishes him so that he is laughable. In tragedy, she drives her husband to murder as in Macbeth and Mailer's An American Dream: She may even become the murderess of her husband, as does the wife in Hemingway's "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber." Martha, the cruel bitch in "Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolf," destroys the happiness of all around her; we are asked to have some sympathy for her because her bitchiness is partially the result of her childlessness: she has not been able to fill her "inner space" as Erick Erickson would advise as the means of mental health for women. Such an aggressive, nagging woman is seen by authors and psychologists alike as sexually frustrated and hence neurotic, unnatural. Through aggressiveness and self-assertion, women are shown to make men their slaves, especially economically: they serve as ball-and-chain. Mailer and Lawrence identify women with the conservative forces of society; these men see society as the enemy of their self-development and as responsible for the sterility and anguish of modern life -- as do Chekhov and Lessing. But the cure suggested by Mailer and Lawrence: to revert to a primitive asocial acceptance of sexuality as life's supreme value -- is as romantic as Love Story's suggestion for solving life's problems by dying young.

Not only by refusing to submit to men but simply by existing, women in literature have been shown to destroy men. In one of the first novels ever written, Chrétien de Troyes' 12th century Erec and Enide, even the most submissive wife is shown to have a negative effect. Erec is so enthralled by his bride's beauty that he neglects his male duties as knight and king; his courtiers begin to talk about how he has changed. He can redeem his honor only by humiliating his wife and embarking on a long series of new adventures. Erec's refusal to see his uxoriousness as his own fault results in his blaming Enide, and we are on the way to the stereotype of woman as the dangerous sex which diverts men from their true selves: To explain why women have such power, they are pictured as supernatural; this logically removes the necessity for men to be able to resist. In Keats' poem "La Belle Dame Sans Merci," for example, the knight is seduced by wild, unnatural beauty, and by magical foods; he loses no status, though he is totally unnerved by his experience. Similarly in Robert Frost's poem "Two Witches" the husband of the Witch of Grafton need not be asshamed when his wife says "He enjoyed everything I made him do," even though he is foolish enough to hunt in the dark, in midwinter for berries she craves. The fairy mistress, the witch -- are male fantasies created to avoid confronting male faults.

A woman who is unobtainable is also embued with supernatural powers; romantic heroines such as Guenevere and Isolde who can never be completely

possessed by their lovers cause the downfall of the noblest of men and indeed of entire kingdoms. Their beauty is irresistible because it is a mystery -- in many versions of the Tristan and Isolde story, the great passion is the result of a magic drink. In great passions men worship their beloved. When Lancelot enters Guenevere's bedroom in a French version of the story, he kneels before her, "holding her more dear than the relic of any saint"; after going to bed with her, "he bows and acts precisely as if he were before a shrine." Dante's Beatrice and Petrarch's Laura become more inspirational when translated into sainthood; a dead mistress is no threat! In much Victorian and American literature, the beautiful heroine, usually blonde, serves as her husband's inspiration while he goes off to conquer the wilderness or to war or to his office; as long as she remains in her proper sphere -- the sacrosanct home and boudoir -- he is free to achieve greatness. But her purity, her exalted position, whether as Victorian lady or Southern belle like Daisy Buchanan in Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby, are countered by the lust of the dark beauty, the loose woman or the prostitute, who caters to men's less-exalted needs and is despised for doing so. The goddess herself pays a heavy price for her role-playing, as Arthur Miller's portrait of Marilyn Monroe in After the Fall demonstrates.

Why have these and other sexist images of women prevailed for so long? One answer is that they reflect reality; the Orthodox Jew who each morning thanks God that he was not created a woman is simply being realistic. Since a patriarchal society promulgates a secondary role for women and women do in fact play such roles, literature shows women as the second sex. Another answer is that literature presents these images precisely because they do not represent reality; they may represent either dreams or nightmares -- symbolically they may stand for what is either better or worse than man. Literature shows women as submissive or dominant because such images are useful to establish contrast and conflict; woman as the Other is dynamic, a center of motivation. Helen of Troy and Anna Karenina refuse to play the role of devoted wife; thus we have long powerful stories. Their refusal is central not only to plot but to theme; they accept their tragedy as inevitable in large measure as a result of seeing their role as anti-men, anti-society, anti-God. Without woman as antagonist, the author must resort to another source of conflict; such as nature; this has been, according to Leslie Fiedler, one of the primary devices of American literature, in which isolated heroes fight against nature, or woo her as if she were a woman; women characters are mere props.

Literature which viewed men as heroic when they overcame the temptations symbolized by women was the only tradition open when in the 19th century women authors began to be published significantly. Women writers who attempted to write about the experience of women had to write about these "in their place," that is, they wrote domestic novels or novels of manners. Such works were often viewed condescendingly, as Carol Ohman has recently shown in a paper on the reception of Emily Bronte's Wuthering Heights. When the book appeared under a masculine pseudonym, it received great critical acclaim; as soon as the author's identity was revealed, the criticism became derogatory: virtues became defects. Margaret Mead has pointed out that in every society, whatever women do lacks status; this view is corroborated by Mary Ellman's chapter on phallic criticism. No wonder George Sand and George Eliot continued to hide their identities under male pseudonym as long as they could.

Modern awareness of the sexism of much of our literature is beginning to alter the image of women in literature. Women writers of the 1960's and 70's are writing freely of their experience as female human beings. Women characters are being shown as fallible human beings -- like men, making mistakes about politics as do Anna in Doris Lessing's The Golden Notebook and Miss Jean Brodie in Muriel Spark's novel; like men, going mad because of the pressures of society and weakness of soul instead of from the monthly menstrual flow. Such authors are creating a new literary tradition which may someday produce a female Shakespeare -- capable of creating men and women characters in all their complexity rather than reduced to stereotypes.

WHY WOMEN'S HISTORY?

Linda Gordon

I think we need a women's history, but I also think it will be impossible to create one without a radical transformation of the whole historical discipline and profession -- a radical feminist perspective on all of history.

The clearest way that I know to explain what I mean by that is to describe how I myself came to that conclusion.

To know that we need a history of women you need only try, as I have done, to find out about the situation of women in various historical periods from the existing materials. Take a sampling of textbooks, and look up women in the index, for example. Or take some mongraphs and try to find any analysis of women's roles. Being foiled here, you would go, as I have, to those works categorized as "social history," or to histories of manners. With some fine exceptions, these discuss cuisine, costume, recreation, and women, sometimes in about that order of importance. These subjects are separated out from the real meat of history -- politics, diplomacy, and intellectual developments -- and treated, all too frequently, as oddities. Often there is no analysis at all of the historical significance of these social "trends."

It is not a chronicle of women's life styles that we need. We need an analytic history about women because, as historians, our understanding of entire societies is warped without it. For example, only after studying women in the 16th and 17th century did I realize that the standard textbook interpretations of Puritanism were very distorted because of their ignorance of the situation of Puritan women. Similarly with interpretations of the 18th century, when changes in women's lives, at least in the upper classes, were contributing to a deep transformation of the whole society.

Recently some "real" historians (as opposed to social historians, that is) have written about the feminist movement. Their new focus is a response to the new feminist movement of the 1960's, and the renewed interest among women in our past. (History is, after all, a commodity dependent on the market like any other in capitalist society.) These new books are welcome, but on the whole they are unsatisfactory. Most of the historians in question were presumably attracted to the feminist movement because it was an occasion on which women "made history" in the usual sense of that phrase. Women on these occasions became more visible in terms of historical sources as well as more noticeable because they became public figures. Since these are the criteria that are applied, the histories of feminism are largely the histories of feminist leaders -- of individual and highly exceptional women. Women, furthermore, who frequently acted more like men are expected to act than like women. They were aggressive, free of wifely and motherly obligations, brave, articulate, elitist, competitive -- that is, they were very like men, for good and for bad. Using their lives as examples can often leave us furthur than ever from understanding the conditions of most women's lives and personalities.

It seems to me that one simply cannot write an honest history of women in the present professional concept of the discipline. The prevailing notion of what makes things historically noteworthy excludes women by definition. To put it another way, the things that have usually been considered to constitute feminity, and which women are pressed so hard to conform to, are precisely those things that remove women from the political arena. Although the image of femininity has changed significantly in some ways, in one dimension it has remained the same: what is feminine is almost antithetical to what is powerful. Yet history is made, after all, by the powerful. Since women have had neither political nor economic nor military power, obviously they did not make history and obviously they are not in the history books.

If this suggests similar conclusions about the history of black people, brown people, and working class people, please feel free to draw them.

How can we get out of this dilemma? How can we write the history of women who accomplished nothing and left no records besides. For centuries women's lives were played out inside parlors and bedrooms, or in unskilled or unrecognized drudgery; their energies sapped by endless births and suckling and tending of children; their talents and aspirations thwarted by the fathers or husbands or brothers-in-law upon whom they were entirely dependent, and by a powerful ideology which bade them find their fulfillment in acceptance of their lot. What is there to say about such women?

The search for a solution to that problem has led to pressures for distortion. It is tempting for us women to want to seek out the glowing exceptions to our limited past. It is understandable that we should want to teach our daughters about those few whose circumstances or singularly dauntless characters made them heroes of culture or politics. But what we can learn from these women is very limited. To study the reasons for the imprisonment of the masses of women will be more productive for us now. And most rewarding would be to look for and identify those aspects of popular women's culture which we want to keep.

We can learn something here from the experience of the black history courses that now appear in most colleges. Many of them have become primarily courses in black biographies, giving very little attention to the masses of black people and almost none to black women. This is distorted history and it is directly misleading. It reinforces the false individualist assumptions that peoples' lives are largely within the control of their own will and talent. It fails to give the students any familiarity with the tools of historical analysis that might enable them to understand the world in a critical way, so as to be able to help change it.

But why should black history be taught any differently than white history? Or women's history any differently than men's history? Ultimately almost all the history that is taught in our colleges is misleading because it is written from the point of view of the powerful. Almost none of it ever really expresses the near total powerlessness of the great majority of the world's people.

This is not to say that we should not study the powerful, those who "made history." On the contrary, we need more than ever to do so. We cannot, for example, understand women's subordinate situation without understanding the men who put them there and how they did it. But we must not study them from their own point of view, accepting their own standards,' Victorian gentlemen writing biographies of other Victorian gentlemen. We must analyze the sources of their power and their means of manipulating it from the only standpoint that provides the necessary line of vision -- the standpoint of those oppressed by that power.

There is no such thing as history written without a point of view, "objective history." Point of view is a much deeper thing than bias. Point of view sets up the fundamental categories of analysis through which the historian tries to understand and explain a phenomenon. Some male colleagues of mine have asked, "Now that you're teaching women's history, when will we have a course in men's history?" The point I am making is that all our courses teach men's history (and white men's history, and ruling class men's history at that).

Imagine, if you can, the story of the court of Louis XIV as told by one of his scullery maids, based on kitchen rumors and occasional glimpses of the lower edges of the court hierarchy. The story of Othello as told by Desdemona, Periclean Athens as described by a female slave. Do these suggestions sound sensationalistic? They did to me at first, and I suggest that that reaction reveals how thoroughly we are imbued with conventional historical standards.

We probably cannot create books like these suggestions, for we have no sources. But if we know that this is our goal we can begin to look for the right sources. And there are many things we could do in the meantime.

We need histories of many social phenomena for which there <u>are</u> sources available, but of which historians have not before seen the importance: a history of birth control, of sexual reform movements, of child-raising, of women's work in their homes, of courtship; but above all we need histories of general economic, political and cultural developments from a feminist point of view. We need an analysis of medieval chivalry and court society that will show how the objectification of women was related to the rest of the culture, and to the economic base of the society. We need an analysis of how the attitudes toward women and towards sexuality fit into the rest of Nazi culture. The women's liberation movement has produced some good work on the economic function of women in modern capitalist society -- as a reserve labor force, for example; we need to know how and when this function emerged out of earlier economic functions. We need a feminist analysis of Russian culture. We need an analysis of black slavery in the U.S. from the points of view of black <u>and</u> white women. We need a feminist analysis of Stalinism. We need a history of the United States from the point of view of women. In fact, we need a history of civilization from a feminist point of view.

What I mean by radical feminist history, in more theoretical terms, is the attempt to understand any given situation from the point of view of the most oppressed group concerned. When there are women present, this group will always be female. When there are race differences, it will be black women. When there are class differences, it will be poor women. There is nothing

innately superior about the women's viewpoint. It is just that, like all groups who have been on the bottom, we have learned to survive by being very observant.

One last point: it seems to me very unlikely that this kind of scholarship can come out of our current universities. How could scholarship reflecting the point of view of the oppressed come out of a university system that systematically excludes the oppressed and, when it does admit them, carefully trains them in the ideology of the dominant groups? Our privilege -- and the tenuousness of our privilege -- makes us timid and malleable. Secondly, the competitiveness that the university rests on, only slightly exacerbated by the current depression, is unconducive to the kind of scholarship I am talking about. I think we should consider it as our goal to begin to build up a community of feminist scholars that does not depend so exclusively on the established universities for financial, political, and intellectual support.

A FEMINIST IN EVERY CLASSROOM

Agate Nesaule Krouse

While we are drawing up special courses in Women's Studies and thinking about the day when we will be able to devote much of our attention to those, we have to teach composition, introduction to literature, or advanced courses which have little to do with women and feminism as such. We feel alternately guilty and frustrated academically: if we select extensive material by and about women, for expample, are we giving a distorted view of a particular period of literary history? If we do not, are we merely perpetuating an equally distorted view developed by male critics and historians? Are we sacrificing human responsibility, intellectual standards, loyalty to women? Whether I should exclude Edna St. Vincent Millay or E. E. Cummings from the overcrowded syllabus of an advanced survey course in modern poetry produced a crisis similar to choosing between a thesis on the formal structural elements in the fiction of Doris Lessing, my present topic (The Feminism of Doris Lessing), and having a baby. Women teachers have divided loyalties and responsibilities academically, just as they do in the rest of their lives.

The selection of materials is a large problem, which I hope other participants will discuss in detail. I would like to offer some suggestions on introducing feminist issues in courses where we are limited by required texts, or in which we can only include so much material by and about women in spite of agonizing decisions. Most of my remarks will relate to teaching literature and composition since my suggestions are drawn from my own teaching experience. However, some may be adapted to other disciplines. All of them, I hope, are ways in which women teachers can destroy prejudice or simple ignorance. At the very least, they are ways of alleviating our own frustration until we get all the courses in Women's Studies we need.

1. Discovering and reacting to prejedices of our students.

Women teachers have disadvantages. On the first day of class, some students look disappointed when we walk in. What we say is not always accepted as authoritative: essay exams written by our students may be fuller of qualifying statements (e.g., "you said," "supposedly," etc.) than those of our male colleagues. But in another sense we have great authority when we deal with women's issues. Being able to say, "I know from personal experience that sexual discrimination exists," is important. Anyone who has ever tried to convince students that poems and stories written in the first person are not necessarily about the experiences of the author knows that students often prefer the personal to the artistic or the objective. Whenever I try to explain to my composition classes that a single personal experience is not adequate logical evidence for a large generalization, I meet disbelief. Without being aware of it, students are neo-romantics who prize individual experience; they are receptive to the self-expression of great American writers like Emily Dickinson, and they are entranced by confessional poets like Sylvia Plath.

As women teachers we can take advantage of student preference for the personal. Since we are aware of the sexual roles, absurdities, and injustices, we have an opportunity to remark on them. We are more likely to be believed than our male colleagues who may mention women's issues from a more distant perspective.

Early in the semester it is possible to shock students into a discovery about their own assumptions about women and men. I did that accidentally last year as I was teaching Irwin Shaw's short story, "The Eighty Yard Run" to freshmen. The story presents a marriage in which Louise, the wife, outgrows her husband intellectually and professionally. Students roundly condemned her for being selfish, for calling her husband "baby," for keeping her job which made him feel less successful. I asked if they would react the same way if Christian was the one to hold the successful job, to have professional friends with whom Louise had little in common. They readily admitted that would have been different: men should not be held back if they outgrew their wives; they knew lots of marriages in which the husband was more successful and no longer had common interests with the wife. Not all of them were convinced, of course, by my argument that women should be allowed equal self-realization, but most of them did agree that they had different assumptions about the rights of women and men.

A few years ago, I asked several of my students the well-known feminist riddle. (I did so before the bell rang, since there was no good way of relating it to the material.) A man and his son have an accident; the father is killed, the son is taken to a hospital. He urgently needs an operation to save his life, but the brain surgeon says, "I'm sorry, I can't operate. This boy is my son." Ingenious answers were given: the "father" mentioned in the first part is a priest; one of the fathers is a natural father, the other has adopted the boy or has been the victim of infidelity. Even in a freshman honors class with extremely bright students, no one thought that the brain surgeon could be the mother. The only cheering experience I had with the riddle was when I told it to my nine-year old son, who gave the right answer and looked puzzled, as if that were not a riddle at all since the answer was so obvious. (He later told it to his class, and about half of them got it immediately. That either means that the future of women is great, or it simply means that children have not yet learned one prejudice, or that they know little about the realities of hospital staffing.) This riddle is probably too well known by now to be equally effective, but it may serve as an illustration when one tells students that preconceptions determine how we think.

Shocking students into seeing their own assumptions is possible only early in the course. I find it both impossible and ineffective to pretend that feminist issues do not concern me. Unless war with students is a normal state and unexpected attacks necessary, surprises are best given up. Inevitably my students become conscious of some feminist issues and do not talk themselves into such obvious corners. A friend of mine described them as becoming wary of my enthusiasms, although a more optimistic interpretation is that they become more aware of their own prejudices. Letting students know about one's feminism has the

advantage that occasionally they will bring up women's issues themselves. However, prejudices continue to appear anyway. Last week, for example, as I was discussing imagery in poems by Frost and Dickinson, I found that most of them knew no other flowers than roses and tulips. A male student volunteered the opinion that flowers were a female concern. In another class, a female student said she could sympathize with the dissatisfaction of Tennyson's Ulysses: he was "matched with an aged wife."

Whenever students do reveal their prejudices, we should act on it. To comment briefly does not necessarily lead away from the subject matter. None of us hesitates to correct other fuzzy thinking. However, since we already have an authority in this area which students recognize, we should probably use the same methods and manner we do normally. Extreme indignation or a great deal of time spent exhorting students makes them hostile, a disaster I have not always avoided. They do dismiss personal experience if they come to see it as a personal obsession.

2. Use of examples.

The easiest and most natural method of familiarizing students with feminist issues is to select examples carefully. All of us use examples daily in defining terms and clarifying our generalizations. Many of them can serve the additional prupose of introducing the concerns of women. In discussing connotations, for example, the contrast between bachelor, old maid, and spinster is useful; so is career women and its relationship to Betty Friedan's "mistaken choice." Changing connotations and pejoration can be illustrated by references to mistress now and "To His Coy Mistress," or moll and hussy now and in previous centuries. The functions of allusion can be explained by Born Female in the same five minutes it takes to describe the convincing thesis of the book. That "clever" little saying on the billboard of a local merchant-- "The best home appliance is make from a rib" -- could work for someone less prone to indignation than I am. A theory of comedy may become more clear to students by asking why they laugh at the determinedly lecherous Grandma in Playboy or at one of the basic types of jokes in the same magazine. (The most efficient type combines the stupidity and promiscuity of women: The "sweet young thing" calls the doctor and asks if she left her panties in his office; when he tells her she didn't, she says she'll try the dentist's office next.)

The possibilities in exemplification are endless in teaching English, but other disciplines probably provide opprotunities to do the same: in discussing statistics, studies about the relative opportunities of women and men might be used; in describing a historically important idea, a female proponent might be mentioned; at the very least, in passing back essay exams and discussing the need for details to support generalizations, and entertaining passage from a feminist work might be read in addition to successful student papers. All of us have a repertoire of examples anyway, and it might as well include some that are consciously

3. Selecting reading material which will illustrate general principles which has a feminist content.

Teaching composition is a good opportunity, although with ingenuity this method might work elsewhere. In 1964, I successfully used the paperback edition of The Feminine Mystique in an advanced composition course

to discuss logic, evidence, and argument. Brief passages to illustrate methods of organization,or virtues of style can be mimeographed. For example, since a frequent motif in feminist writing is comparison of the relative opportunities of women and men, passages from Virginia Woolf or Caroline Bird might work well; even those somewhat overworked analogies of women and blacks can illustrate the organization of a comparison. Use of specific detail can be demonstrated by passages from Doris Lessing's The Golden Notebook.

4. Relating the past to present attitudes toward women.

Almost any literature course is likely to touch on Eve and Adam. It's a good idea to mention Eve's intelligence and to suggest that since she was created last, she is superior: God practiced on Adam and then did it right. Most students won't believe it, but some of them will file it away with the rest of some rather peculiar information about the Bible. Discussion of customs or conditions in another century provides ample opportunities for more responsible statements. For instance, explaining "kennel's edge" in Swift's "Description of the Morning" can lead to a brief note on the original reason for men walking on the street side, or to other foolish conventions for which the reasons have disappeared or have been forgotten, but which cause difficulties for women nevertheless.

The relationship of the past to the present, however, has to be treated tactfully. Years of taking essay exams have made us all artists of the transitional sentence. In one of my classes we went from outlived conventions, to outlived laws, to abortion as reasonably prohibited when all surgery was highly dangerous, to a highly emotional outburst by a male student about the rights of the father of the fetus. It was a lively fifteen minutes, but we never did finish discussing the poem.

5. Endorsing values which we would like to see exercised in the treatment of women.

In basic literature courses, moral questions inevitably come up even if one concentrates primarily on such formal elements as point of view, figurative language, or irony are linked with ideal behavior or clear perception. Students condemn or praise characters on moral grounds, grounds, even if they are asked to comment on the methods of characterization. Characters suffer if they lack fairness, honesty, consideration of individual worth; they are objects of satire if they are snobs or lechers. We may as well endorse some values as worth having generally.

In particular, students need to be reminded that besides responsibility to others, human beings are also responsible to themselves. In practice, students are probably a bit more altruistic than others, and they often condemn characters for placing the responsibility to themselves first: Tennyson's Ulysses was "irresponsible" for leaving his people, his son, and last of all, his wife. Tom Wingfield, in Glass Menagerie, should have stayed with Laura and Amanda. If we introduce the responsibility to self in various contexts, perhaps some students will not be so surprised when when we argue that self-development and self-relization is the right of Louise in "Eighty-Yard Run," or when their own mothers go back to school instead of sending them pay-checks earned by long hours in the dime-store.

Even in composition courses and advanced course, moral values are implied in writing, discussion, and argument. Teaching students to avoid hasty generalizations, unexamined cliches, or mistakes in cause and effect is potentially moral training: perhaps one student will some day stop before he tells his wife that she shouldn't work because that will turn their children into dope addicts.

6. Asking at least occasionally what is the attitude toward women in a particular work.

It is easier and probably more responsible to raise that question about the work itself, rather than about the writer generally, although the temptations to do otherwise are immense when one teaches Light in August or For Whom the Bell Tolls. The question is interesting in itself, it allows students to see the indivdual characteristics of a particular work, and it can lead naturally to other literary concerns. For example, what kind of women is Donn's "Valediction: Forbidding Mourning" addressed to? How does she differ from the kind of women Burns' "My Love is Like a Red, Red Rose" would appeal to? Having established that Donne's women can feel and think, one can progress naturally to Eliot's "dissociation of sensibility," or to differences in imagery or meter in the two poems.

If the wish to disgress is intense, one can also take various easy shots at male critics. Dryden's objection to Donne perplexing "the fair sex with philosophy when he should engage their hearts and entertain them with the softness of love," or C. S. Lewis's question, "What can any sensible women make of such lovemaking?" can be related to "Valediction." In fact, the bias of male critics can almost always be mentioned naturally after the attitude toward women in a particular work has been established. After a discussion of Doris Lessing's treatment of pregnancy, childbirth, and motherhood in A Proper Marriage, one male critic's objection to those sections as excessively dull and long can be introduced. Such male experiences as hunting, war, or sexual initiation, commonplace as they are, and extensively treated as they have been, are seldom condemned as dull per se.

7. Working seriously on establishing relationships between concerns of women and the formal elements in a discipline.

Not only the future of Women's Studies, but of all teaching is here. I have only a few preliminary observations about the teaching of literature, but I hope to hear of possibilities from other participants in other fields. Once feminist concerns have been shown as inextricably linked to various formal elements in a literary work, other methods for introducing them will be superflous. I am currently working on my dissertation (which I hope to finish by June), The Feminism of Doris Lessing, and have thought about the relationship of feminist concepts to such matters as imagery, methods of characterization, selection of literary materials, structure, methods of establishing the universal or the ideal in a fictional world. I hope to show that in the case of this one writer at least, isolation of feminist concepts leads naturally and efficiently to discoveries about formal characteristics. That is true

even though I have discovered that Ms. Lessing's feminism is far more limited than her popular reputation would lead one to believe. Feminism is also not as central in her work as it is in Virginia Woolf's, for example. This suggests to me that even negative results of a search for feminist concepts in a literary work may be a fruitful beginning for a literary analysis.

So far I have only used the basic procedure of my dissertation once in teaching. Since Doll's House was not in our text, I read the students Shaw's summary, and began a discussion of Hedda Gabler by asking whether they thought Ibsen was a feminist still or if he had changed his mind. Definitions of feminism, its historical and contemporary importance, true and superficial emancipation, alternatives open to women, all followed naturally, as did the discussion of characters. But the structure of the play, specifically the carefully contrasted and balanced characters, became clear as we tried to answer the original question. Feminism was a way of arriving at the effectiveness of the work itself, and the work made feminism understandable.

I am not sure how effectively other works can be taught this way, nor what specific relationships can be found. I am excited that other women are working on this problem in various ways. If writing useful to other women comes out of this conference, I hope some of it deals with the relationship of feminism to literature and other disciplines. I would be very interested in hearing of the projects others are working on. I would also be interested in helping to collect or write down the experiences of women who are too busy on other valuable work to do so themselves.

WOMEN, EDUCATION, AND SOCIAL POWER

Marcia Landy

No discussion of revolutionary movements is possible without a confrontation of the meaning and nature of power. Political theorists from Marx to C. Wright Mills to Amitai Etzioni have attempted to formulate the role power plays in society, who holds that power and how it is transmitted and perpetuated by particular groups. We are all familiar with the analysis of the powerlessness of minority groups and with the battle cries "Power to the People" and "Black Power" as part of the process of redefining social reality and social roles.

The women's movement, involved as it is with the examination of social roles, is in the mainstream of formulating concepts of power in its reaction against the male-dominated power elite. And we, in the academic profession, are concerned with these formulations and with modes of translating a feminist politic into the reality of the classroom. Questions about the role of women as teachers and students and about the role of curriculum thus force us to continue the academic dialogue which has been active in all universities for the past decade and a half, a dialogue which has centered on the nature of professional roles, the authority role of the professor, the objectivity of the information which is discussed and written about, and the students' problems in assimilating that information and acquiring knowledge.

If radical men have been vitally concerned with restructuring academic life, what is our role as women in evaluating traditional attitudes while also evaluating the male critique of those attitudes? Are notions of power ingrained so deeply in our culture that it is impossible to revaluate them thoroughly and so free ourselves from the "nightmare of history?" If not, where does one begin?

For our purposes, let us begin with basic attitudes toward power and then let us evaluate even the best critique of social power in order to determine whether they respond to the new consciousness of women.

A basic primer for such a discussion is the language and mythology of western culture. Those of us who teach literature see repeated endlessly a mythology of male dominance. If we open the Bible to the Book of Genesis, read Hesiod's Theogony or Milton's Paradise Lost, we see how the creation myths firmly establish the notion of male Godhead and its consequences for male dominance in the prevailing social order. Aeschylus' Oresteia further dramatizes the supremacy of male rights over the female.[1] In the evolution from chaos, the establishment of cosmic boundaries is accomplished by a male figure. Given divine sanction by the supreme male god, he imposes power over nature. He also imposes his power over other males, just as the male gods have subdued other unruly gods and demi-gods and forced them to acknowledge the one supreme male godhead. And some men, emulating the divine

paradigm, have subdued rebellious competitors in the name of justice, law and order. Hesiod explains the rule of Zeus thus in the Theogony:

> When the Olympian gods had brought their struggle to a successful end and had forcibly vindicated their rights against the Titans, Mother Earth advised them to invite Zeus, with his far-sighted ken, to be king and lord over the gods. Zeus in return distributed rights and privileges among them.[2]

We are all familiar also with the domestic roles of the gods in the Theogony and the relationship of male to female in the Bible: "And .they desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee"[3] (Gen. I:16). The human institution of marriage is patterned on the divine model and thus the power of the male over the female is sanctioned by the gods. In Paradise Lost, echoing the language of classical mythology, Milton sets forth the marital relationship expressly in terms of government and rule:

> Was shee thy God, that her thou didst obey
> Before his Voice, or was shee made they Guide
> Superior, or but equal, that to her
> Thou didst resign thy Manhood, and Place
> Wherein God set thee above her made of thee,
> And for thee, whose perfection far excell'd
> Hers in real dignity: adorn'd
> She was indeed, and lovely to attract
> Thy Love, not thy Subjection, and her Gifts
> Were such as under Goverment well seem'd,
> Unseemly to bear rule, which was thy part
> And person, hadst thou known thyself aright.
> (Paradise Lost, X, 145-156)[4]

And so from the cosmic level to political institutions to the institution of marriage, the male right was to rule over women. And political rule in government, like domestic rule in the family, comes down to the power of the ruler and the necessary subordination of the ruled, centering in the mythology of the ruler's superiority over the subject. One writer describes the nature of political power thus:

> In addition to the great advantage accruing to them from the fact of being organized, ruling minorities are usually so constituted that the individuals who make them up are distinguished from the mass of the governed by qualities that give them a certain material, intellectual, or even moral superiority; or else they are the heirs of individuals who possess such qualities. In other words, members of a ruling minority have some attribute, real or apparent, which is highly esteemed and very influential in the society in which they live.[5]

We are told furthermore that in order to accomplish goals within a society some kind of power is necessary:

> The realization of most societal goals, even in situations in which the actor's commitment and knowledge are considerable, requires the application of power. That is, under most circumstances, societal goals and decisions not supported by at least some degree of some kind of power will not be implemented. Hence, powerless actors are passive actors. The assumption which underlies these statements is that the realization of a societal goal requires introducing a change into societal relations, either in the societal environment or among the member units, and, as a rule, attempts to introduce changes (as distinct from changes that occur "anyhow," which do not constitute the realization of a goal), encounter some resistance. Unless this resistance is reduced, a course of action set will not be a course of action followed. Power is a capacity to overcome part or all of the resistance, to introduce changes in the face of opposition (this includes sustaining a course of action or preserving a status quo that would otherwise have been discontinued or altered.
>
> Power is always relational and relative. An actor by himself is not powerful or weak; he may be powerful in relation to some actors in regard to some matters and weak in relation to other actors on other matters. Here, we are interested chiefly in the macroscopic consequences of the application of power; hence, we are concerned with societal power and not with the power of individuals or small groups, although several of the following statements and propositions apply to these units as well.[6]

Although power may have negative associations, particularly being associated with conflict, there are many positive examples of the application of power in cooperative terms:

> The tendency to associate power with conflict rather than with cooperation are part of a more general tendency to view power negatively. Hence, it should be emphasized that at least in macroscopic social structures, the realization of many values depend on a "proper" power constellation rather than on the elimination of the role of power. Thus for instance, democratic processes presuppose a plurality of power centers, each strong enough to compete with the others but not so strong as to be able to undermine the societal framework in which the democratic competition takes place. And in societies in which the law prescribes civil and human rights for its members, the effective safeguard of these rights only in part rests with societal education and in the identification of various members with these values they need also to be supported by at least a latent capacity for any group of citizens whose rights are denied to exert sufficient power to activate the societal mechanisms necessary to restore their rights. The same holds for "free enterprise" and "free" markets; they may exist between units similar in economic power but not between oil companies and gasoline stations or between automobile manufacturers and automobile dealers. To put it differently, the power relations

among the member-units of a society and between that society and other societies are a major determinant of the degree to which that societal structure will be consonant or in conflict with the values to which the members "individually" and as a collective unit are committed. In short, effective universalism is not to be expected without an appropriate power distribution.[7]

The concern in the women's movement for woman's power grows out of the awareness that women have had both a limited and an indirect share in the control over human destiny and their own destinies. Thus we confront again the problem of sex roles and their relationship to politics as formulated by Kate Millett:

> In introducing the term "sexual politics," one must first answer the inevitable question "Can the relationship between the sexes be viewed in a political light at all?" The answer depends on how one defines politics. This essay does not define the political as that relatively narrow and exclusive world of meetings, chairmen, and parties. The term "politics" shall refer to power-structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another. By way of parenthesis one might add that although an ideal politics might simply be conceived of as the arrangement of human life on agreeable and rational principles from whence the entire notion of power <u>over</u> others should be banished, one must confess that this is not what constitutes the political as we know it, and it is to this that we must address ourselves.[8]

Millett, however, wisely does not discount the necessity for power arrangements, but refers here rather to power "as we know it," thus implying like Etzioni that power need not be conflictual, that it can be cooperative. But the problem is how to translate or transform power -- male-dominated, elitist -- into a system of more equitable social relations, which recognizes the interests of historically subordinated and deprived groups, and particularly one which avoids, if at all possible, the replacement of one dominant, controlling group by another modelled on the same pattern. This raises the fundamental question of whether women are going to adopt the same patterns of control over men that men have historically adopted over women. Have we no choice but to retain the structure that has caused suffering not only for women but for Blacks and the economically oppressed? In other words, will it be possible to reconstitute our roles, all social roles, without a thoroughgoing alteration of the social structure with its unequal distribution of power?

It is unfortunate but inevitable that in a state of tansition many of us must act on the basis of half-formed ideas and existing models of gaining power; however, we must constantly be aware of the consequences of certain present actions. Let me be concrete about this, In an attempt to make room for more women, the patriarchal institutions open up "room at the top" for a few. Always there has been room for one or two "trusties," to use prison terminology, in order to mediate the stark differences between those who are in

power and those who are out. And the intense conflict for women who have a genuine concern about social change becomes whether their acceptance of the position will be another instance of assimilationism or a real possibility for changing attitudes within the institution. After all, isn't it better to be on the inside in order to help others who are dependent, from a position of strength? Better a sympathetic person in that position than another unsympathetic male bureaucrat. It would be too simple to say that power corrupts only when the individual is corruptible, because we all know that we have a human tendency to postpone the pain of charge through perpetuating the familiar pain of habit. The isolation of the position at the top is a great price to pay and few of us, if we are honest, can or need admit that we have the currency. Heroism, too, is most often defined in terms of self-sacrifice for which everyone must guiltily pay.

The woman's movement in its need to limit male power is seeking to open opportunities for women in all areas of society. It seeks to provide more opportunities for women in government, in the work world, in education, in the arts. And it seeks to reduce the domestic bondage which has kept women isolated in the home by developing new structures for child care. But subsuming all of these arrangements has been its abiding concern for solidarity, for defining pragmatic concerns in relation to a vision of social reality which allows for women to become human and thereby for everyone to assert their humanity. The competitive, conflictual mode of power as we have known it is to reduce and dehumanize the competitor in order to justify the necessity for control.

I am not arguing against or for reapprochement with men but rather for several precendent concerns. Most immediately we have to resist the blandishments of cooperations with men as being premature because we are still very active in the enterprise of articulating the nature of our experience of history and of questioning existing social structures. We have by no means uncovered male myths about women nor have we done more than begin to discover what inhabiting our space can mean. Thus, group solidarity, not only for effective political ends but also for enhancing our self-perceptions and our perceptions of society, is more crucial than ever. Still extremely relevant to this issue of group solidarity is Stokely Carmichael's and Charles V. Hamilton's idea of group solidarity as a bridge to human solidarity:

> Black Power recognizes-it must recognize-the ethnic basis of American politics as well as the power-oriented nature of American politics. Black Power therefore calls for black people to consolidate behind their own, so that they can bargain from a position of strength. But while we endorse the <u>procedure</u> of group solidarity and identity for the purpose of attaining certain goals in the body politic, this does not mean that black people should strive for the same king of rewards (i.e., end results) obtained by the white society. The ultimate values and goals are not domination or exploitation of other groups, but rather an effective share in the total power of the society.[9]

The "position of strength" to which they refer resides in the group's awareness of common goals which cannot be violated by the divisive methods of those in power in their attempt to retain their dominance. Furthermore, those particular goals are a negation of the prevalent modes of exploitation and dehumanization. When the group is strong in its identification of its common concerns and when its members are mutually supportive and share in the process of defining the group's aims, none will get lost and the chances of failure in attaining the ends are much less real.

How do all of these ideas apply specifically to concepts of education and to the structure of our educational institutions? The connection between education, power, and social change lies precisely in education's concern with analysing buman institutions, understanding human creativity, the nature of language, and the problems of history, and in its concern with applying that knowledge to actual situations both within and without the school. The school -- for our purposes it is most fruitful to look particularly at the university -- is another major institution that feeds into the power structure as it now exists. It is a major vehicle in the "production" of technocrats, and we should wish to see it rather as an essential vehicle for change. This means that we do not wish merely for it to assimilate more women, but we want that accomodation to make itself felt in the way the university is run, the way the teaching reflects altered perceptions about the world, the way the curriculum reflects a concern for the appropriation of knowledge, not mere fact or imitation of another, and the way research becomes responsive to human problems, mirroring profound needs for altering the social system of which the university is a significant part.

Since there is a pattern in American society - in the history of labor unions and of social welfare - of making concessions to the agitators for the express purpose of keeping things intact, it is crucial that the proponents of change agitate equally for participation in the implementing and directing of changes, as well as in decision-making, rather than leaving the implemention in the hands of existing authorities. The president, his advisors, the deans, are not those best suited for either understanding or effectively and fully carrying out educational and structural changes in the university. There are many reasons for a healthy mistrust of the bureaucratic hierarchy, the most significant being that it perpetuates in a mystifying way the power of one group over another. Although the university is supposed to be a teaching institution, it looks more like a corporation involved in productivity, profit and loss, and its "managers," the men who run the business, will not relinquish the power which they perceive as working in the best interests of the institution without an organized effort on the part of the now supine faculties and students to reappropriate their right to make decisions. The question of decision-making is vital to the woman's movement, because we have rarely been in the position of making decisions. However, we will neither get the programs we want nor be able to expand existing programs without organizing for our own ends and supporting all efforts to democratize decision-making.

How is it possible, however, to have democratic participation in the process of running a university, given the size of the institution? Furthermore, how is it possible to maintain a sense of the appropriate directions to take, when the major tendency in a technological society is toward numerical reality, toward more abstract and theoretical forms of knowledge, which create an ever-widening distance between specialists and between lay person and expert? Some social scientists are working to focus technology in a more human direction:

> And, with the growing sophistication of computer-based simulation procedures - simulations of economic systems, of social behavior, of decision problems - we have the possibility, for the first time, of large-scale "controlled experiments" in the social sciences. These, in turn, will allow us to plot "alternative futures," thus greatly increasing the extent to which we can choose and control matters that affect our lives.
>
> In all this, the university, which is the place where theoretical knowledge is sought, tested, and codified in a disinterested way, becomes the primary institution of the new society. Perhaps it is not too much to say that if the business firm was the key instutution of the past hundred years, because of its role in organizing production for the mass creation of products, the university will become the central institution of the next hundred years because of its role as the new source of innovation and knowledge.
>
> To say that the primary institutions of the new age will be intellectual is not to say that the majority of persons will be scientists, engineers, technicians, or intellectuals. The majority of individuals in contemporary society are not businessmen, yet one can say that this has been a "business civilization." The basic values of society have been focused on business institutions, the largest rewards have been found in business, and the strongest power has been held by the business community.[10]

Perhaps as this writer indicates, it will be possible to redirect technological research toward alternative goals and toward creating greater possibilities for human choice and democratic action. The problem remains, however, in the articulation of the analogy of business corporations and the university. Thus far, technological research has tended to produce an alienation in the university similar to that of the large corporation.

Because of the nature of the alienation women have experienced, barred as they have been from all but a few of the professions and therefore kept in ignorance, they are perhaps equipped to use their past experiences to expose the fraudulence of the language of mystification which specialization breeds, to underline the connection between control and ignorance, and also to insist that the tough-minded, energetic, male objectivity, which has bred so much research destructive to the general society, must give way to more personal, human kinds of interaction. Rather than seeking to emulate, therefore, the "tough-minded"

male, we can be very instrumental in breaking down the frustrating impersonality which masks a basic unconcern for human needs. We can also explore how collectivities in a mass society can function to the benefit of individuals. Collectivities can be either tyrannical or not, depending on the responsiveness of their sub-groupings and depending on how they make available appropriate kinds of information and make possible democratic structures of decision-making. Instead of letting the department chairman of the dean make the decision, of leaving all government in the hands of the father and the husband, we can examine new ways of organizing so as to share responsibility for decisions. The dangers and possibilities of group organization have been described thus by one writer:

> In general, formal organizations are to be identified as mass organizations, not by their size, but when they lack intermediate units which have some autonomy from the central leadership. In the absence of a structure of smaller groups, formal organizations themselves become remote from their members. That is, they get beyond the reach of their members, and as a result cannot deeply influence them nor command their allegiance in the face of competition for member loyalties. Consequently, members of excessively bureaucratized organizations may become mobilized by totalitarian elites. This is illustrated by the Nazi success in capturing many youth groups in Germany during the 1920's...
>
> Large-scale organizations that fail to develop or sustain independent subgroups tend to be characterized by low levels of membership participation, mass organizations engender widespread apathy. Furthermore, the lack of a pluralist structure within organizations, like its absence in the larger society, not only discourages membership participation. It also discourages the formation of an informed membership, the development of new leadership, and the spread of responsibility and authority, so that the wide gap between the top and the bottom of mass organizations tends to be bridged by manipulation.[11]

In an attempt to remove "the wide gap between the top and bottom" women can insist that in the university barriers be broken down between specialist and generalist. They can place greater emphasis on interdisciplinary kinds of study, which explore ways of mediating between specialized terminology and concepts and structures which organize, synthesize, and clarify common interests, and thus help mitigate the tendency, which exists both within and without the university, toward incapacitating people from forming judgements because of their inability to understand the problem. The paralysis of action due to the fear of insuffiecient technical data is one of the major causes of inertia and over-dependence on the authority figure. This problem takes on significant meaning for women when one considers that the distance between expert and lay person mirrors the ancient distance between the male decision-maker and the female subordinate. In a sence. we have been lay persons historically, excluded as we have been from the sciences, from the sources of male power in business, government, and the academy. We can, I suppose, now become technologists too, but I suppose that it is more to our advantage and to the advantage of society to become something other than what men have been,

just as we want men to become what they have not been. This is not to say that women should not learn specializations, become professionals, avail themselves of all availabel information, but a healthy mistrust of mere specialization is necessary. Our support of interdisciplinary studies therefore a recognition that the separation of disciplines must fuse with the unity of human knowledge. We would not want to abrogate but rather to translate special information and make it generally accessible in order not to perpetuate the power elite's monopoly on information and ideas. It follows, therefore, that we should not succumb to the temptation to model ourselves in the image of the male technocrat. The kinds of questions raised by Robert Merton in Social Theory and Social Structure should be the kind of questions we explore as we intensify our examination of our attitudes towards learning and the bureaucracy:

> We should like to know the class location of intellectuals who find their way into these bureaucracies. Concretely, at what points do alternatives emerge in the intellectual's career line? What pressures lead him to prefer public to private bureaucracies? To what extent does alienation from and repudiation of business-class values play a part in such choices? What are the sources of such estrangement? Can we thus throw light on the common pattern of intellectuals divorcing themselves from the nominally sovereign values to identify themselves with the fate of potential power-centers? Does the flow of intellectuals into public bureaucracy serve as a barometric reading of actual or impending shifts in power? What anticipations are common among intellectuals who expect to find their spiritual home in a state bureaucracy? Data on questions such as these constitute a first step in determining the later effects of bureaucratic life upon the intellectual. Only when this information is assembled can we test the hypothesis that bureaucracies provoke gradual transformations of the alienated intellectual into the a-political technician, whose role is to serve whatever strata happen to be in power.[12]

Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann posit also a focus for the social sciences which can be extended as a model for learning in general:

> More generally, we would contend that the analysis of the role of knowledge in the dialectic of individual and society, of personal identity and social structure, provides a crucial complementary perspective for all areas of sociology. This is certainly not to deny that purely structural analyses of social phenomena are fully adequate for wide areas of sociological inquiry, ranging from the study of small groups to that of large institutional complexes, such as the economy of politics. Nothing is further from our intentions than the suggestion that a sociology-of-knowledge "angle" ought somehow to be injected into all such analyses. In many cases this would be unnecessary for the cognitive goal at which these studies aim. We are suggesting, however, that the integration of the findings of such analyses into the body of sociological theory requires more than the casual obeisance that might be paid to the "human factor" behind the un-

> covered structural data. Such integration requires a systematic accounting of the dialectical relation between the structural realities and the human enterprise of constructing reality - in history.[13]

Such a perspective inevitably alters content, curriculum, and learning styles in the university. It alters research patterns too, by stressing relations, syntheses, and comparison. It stresses, furthermore, a human center for intellectual concerns.

The change of content also brings with it questions about a change in the process of learning. Earlier I suggested that the governing patterns in universities should be changed to reflect the changing consciousness in the social order. But how do these changed attitudes come into existence? Can there be an open democratic structure at all if there is no change at the grass roots of the classroom? If individuals and smaller groups have not assimilated democratic procedures, how is it possible to transform the larger group? The classroom should be the basic arena for the exchange of information. If, for example, students feel that they are incapable of formulating appropriate questions and of locating the knowledge they receive, there seems to be little likelihood of their being able to break out of authoritarian modes of behaviour. If the presentation of the content by an authority figure is the image they receive of the learning situation, this already sets up a passivity which no amount of good will seems to eradicate. The teacher can cajole, plead, ask leading questions, but the possibility of lively and involved discussion becomes limited to the few brave souls who are either foolhardy, well advanced beyond the others, or not damaged by the fear of failure. Furthermore, the imposing image of the authority absorbs the attention and enery of the group to the extent that interaction with others in the class is considered inferior and irrelevant. It is true that some teachers manage to convey more of a sense of the personal while lecturing or leading class discussion, and this often goes part of the way toward breaking down some of the intimidating aspects of involvement in discussion and questioning. But nothing takes the place of actually having the students experience themselves as an integral part of that group situation through creative and meaningful interchanges of questions and ideas. The authority of information given by the one individual, while personalizing that information because it is spoken rather than read, still does not have that much advantage over the experience of the open library -- at least in the library one can experience diverse points of view, while too often the student is victimized in the classroom by only one. (Again, I should note that there are of course many exceptions to this uni-dimensional framework. Many professor genuinely try to present several points of view.)

For the purposes of this discussion of the connection between the social manifestations of bureaucratic power and the classroom, I would wish to assert that the role of the teacher as a negative power image is one which women in the profession should question, because it is part of the system which perpetuates authoritarian political and patriarchal control. We should resist the temptation to do this and we

should strive constantly to experiment with and evaluate new styles for learning. This means allowing students greater freedom in designing their own study programs. in structuring the way information is presented, in actually directing discussions, and in developing projects which reflect creative approaches in internalizing ideas. This means also using the teacher in a different way than in the past, as a clarifier, a translator, a resource for uncovering source of new information, and as an interpreter.

The hardest element to describe is the personal element. The group experience in the classroom should lead away from alienation and toward vital and personal involvement. I am not advocating, as some critics of classroom innovation have often implied about new learning processes, turning the classroom into an encounter group or a sensitivity session, although I am advocating a therapeutic approach in healing the disjunction between objective knowledge and self-knowledge. In the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance, knowledge -- at least for men -- was rooted in a human and ethical experience. Even the physical space designed for learning should reflect the uniqueness and importance of the learning experience, not the "hard times" of the factory and the grimness of the work ethic. We must also, therefore, agitate for more humane settings in which learning can better take place.

We need to learn more about how groups function, who leads groups, where the ideas of a single leader has its limitations, what kinds of things open up creative possibilities for the group and which create a closed, silent, and uncooperative entity. For many teachers, especially those devoted to the transmission of mere fact and to "tough-minded" scholarly enterprise, this discussion may indeed seem like the final destruction of the university; it may indeed be the destruction of the university as we have known it for the past two hundred years. Yet it is ironic that the liberation of the classroom and of research has such tremendous potential for being truly scholarly, for learning and transmitting ideas in a more creative way.

And learning which we truly appropriate gives us a different kind of power than that which leads to managing and controlling others. Internalized learning should lead to inner strangth and power because it informs and gives meaning to our own behavior and to social reality. It frees us to make choices and accept the consequences of those choices. It enables us to resist the destructive attempts by others to control and enables us to work with rather than against each other.

Thus, for the sake of reconstituting our self image as women, but also for the sake of reconstituting society, the woman's movement needs to look very closely at educational institutions and these institutions need to look very closely at the new roles of women.

In this way we can contribute immeasurably to women's liberation and to cultural liberation, to the alteration of power relations in a very conflicted, threatened, and dangerous society.

(1) Aeschylus, "Orestia," Aeschylus 1. David Grene and Richmond Lattimore, eds., (New York, 1970).

(2) Hesiod, Theogony, Norman O. Brown, ed. (Indianapolis, 1953),

(3) Genesis 1:16, Holy Bible.

(4) John Milton, Paradise Lost, Merritt Y. Hughes, ed. (New York, 1957), pp. 409-410.

(5) Guetano Mosca, The Ruling Class, Power in Societies, Marvin E Olson, ed. (London, 1970), p. 124.

(6) Amitai Etzioni, "Power as a Social Force," Power in Societies, p. 18.

(7) Ibid., p. 20.

(8) Kate Millett, Sexual Politics, (Garden City, New York, 1969), pp. 23-24.

(9) Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, "Black Power," Power in Societies, p. 363.

(10) Daniel Bell, "Notes on the Post-Industrial Society," Power in Societies, p. 396.

(11) William Kornhauser, "The Politics of Mass Society," Power in Societies, p. 416.

(12) Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, (London, 1964), p. 214.

(13) Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality, (Garden City, New York, 1967), p. 186.

WHAT WOMEN'S STUDIES CAN DO FOR WOMEN'S LIBERATION

Eleanor J. Lewis

I believe that a major goal of a women's studies program is to develop in its students an ability to do research relevant to women. Currently, disciplines that require their students to be competent in research infrequently train students to do relevant research. In fact, we could say that the woman student is trained in the male model to work in very specialized areas, doing esoteric research that is of use to very few people and read by even fewer. However, there are some people in our society, most notable Ralph Nader and his co-workers, who are doing socially relevant research and use research results to effect societal change. I believe that a concerted effort of applied research in areas relating to women would provide us with much needed information that could become the basis for future actions, laws, and change projects. In many cases where the treatment and status of women is wanting, there are few firm facts to guide us in selecting an appropriate strategy for change. Research data could give us the information we need to correct the situation most efficiently.

For instance, currently many retirement funds pay different retirement benefits to men and women workers of the same age with the same work history. The basis for this differential in retirement pay benefits is the longer life span of women which results in their getting the same total retirement benefits, but it is spread out over a longer period of time. However, it is possible that if one controls for number of years worker, all or part of the difference in life span disappears. That is, with increasing years of work, and possible types of work, women's life span may shorten and become increasingly similar to men's. But currently this is only conjecture. What is needed is a study of longevity, controlling for sex, race, work history, and any other variable that may be relevant. Only then will we know if we have retirement pay rates arranged equitably.

Another area of study concerns the university environment, something we are all very familiar with. On each campus many important decisions are made about an individual's life, and most of the procedures surrounding these decisions have never been systematically studies for their inclusion of discriminatory practices. Thus, a detailed study of the personnel offices' procedures for hiring is a potential project. Data could be collected in three ways: speaking with employees and officials of the personnel office, interviewing job applicants as they leave the personnel office, and having researchers pose as applicants and go through the personnel procedures themselves. Using the last method, the researchers could also test the limits of the system by sending in an excellent male typist who wants a secretarial position. The treatment he receives would be indication of an offices sexist assumptions and policies. Similarly organized studies could be done of vocational planning and placement offices, of health services, and of counseling centers.

Another area of study could deal with the treatment women receive as patients -- mental and medical. Looking first at the medical profession, gynecologists and obstetricians would be the most relevant to study. It would be good to know how and why men enter this profession and who they are. Then one could go on to study the standard medical procedures followed -- their rationale and their effect -- and compare them with procedures used in other countries. What are the advantages and disadvantages of each treatment.

The entire area of women as mental patients is ripe for study. I am sure you are all aware of the recent psychology experiment by Broverman and Broverman that found that mental health professionals define healthy person and healthy man as being very similar. However, their definition of health person was very different from their definition of healthy woman , using their own definition. Considering these results, what happens to women in therapy -- are they urged and reinforced for becoming healthy women or healthy people. Since there is a large and significant difference between the two groups, this is a crucial question. Since millions of women receive psychotherapy, this is a very important question.

By now I am sure you agree that these studies are relevant and need to be done. To organize, monitor, and get the proper leverage from these studies, I propose that centers for such studies be created in women's studies programs. The programs and centers would train student researchers, organize and fund projects, and provide research leaders. A national center would provide support staff and some additional funds. But the major responsibility of the national office would be to convert these research results into politically powerful documents that are used to create pressure for significant social change, e.g. changing how retirement benefits are computed, how mental health professionals are trained, how medical doctors decide treatment methods to use. Changes in these areas and many others could significantly improve the lives of all women, and students in women's studies programs could be providing a major impetus and contribution to these studies.

FEMININE SUBCULTURE AND FEMALE MIND

Nancy Reeves

More than a century ago, Sarah Grimke set out passionately to prove "that intellect is not sexed."[1] But there is a sense in which it is. Growing up female implies that internalization of a set of values, perceptions, codes, and qualities that subvert the reasoning faculties. Anatomy is not destiny, but biography may be -- for we are programmed by our preoccupations. And women, incased in the feminine subculture, with its tribal duties and hedonistic imperatives, with the seduction of creature comforts and the terrible temptations of vicarious living and are programmed in a system antithetical to rigor and reflections. The female mind thus becomes a discrete phenomenon. Specialized to sex and to service, it is the product of what women do and what they do not do in the matrix of their assigned place. For although the second sex is unique among underprivileged entities in living within the pale of the power elite, it still remains a sex apart -- outside the mainstream of the society.

Feminine Subculture

In anthropological usage, according to Oscar Lewis, "the term culture implies, essentially, a design for living which is passed down from generation to generation."[2] Certainly the design for living passed down from generations of mothers to generations of daughters comes within this definition and so I postulate a specific feminine subculture within which women conduct their lives and which determines their reality level. For every pattern in the human condition becomes a form of ethnocentrism; external phenomena are then viewed through the special lenses it provides. In consequence, even the best minds, submerged in a given context, tend to subordinate their critical faculties to the range of established possibilities. For females, the stress in the range of these established possibilities is on "the intimate, the sensory, the detailed, and the personal."[3] Modish ignorance is applauded; intellectual endeavor and introspection have no place.

Jean Rostand has written: "A person too early cut off from the common interest of men is exposed to inner impoverishment." I believe that to live in the feminine subculture is to be cut off from the common interests of the race and that females as a sex are therefore the victims of inner impoverishment, deflected from the habit of consciousness, and in continous flight from wonder.

The Theory

Contemporary scholars agree that the process of sex-typing develops rapidly in the early years and is firmly established by age 3-4. Thus most female individuals enter the sexual ghetto at an early age and remain in it for the rest of their lives. This means, as Karl Mannheim has

noted, that "...it would be false to deduce...that all ideas and sentiments which motivate an individual have their origin in him alone, and can be adequately explained solely on the basis of his own life-experience ...." [4] Rather, the individual, in this case woman, finds herself in an inherited situation complete with preformed patterns of concept and conduct. In a sense, the psyche itself becomes a segment of the given, the knowledge "which it acquires presupposing a finished picture of reality, an ontology."[5] This picture is composed of crystallizations of meaning derived not from the individual alone acting as an independent agency, but from the view of the world held by the group to which she belongs. And in that group, "Every concept represents a sort of taboo against other possible sources of meaning..."[6] making the individual impervious to meaning derived from other sources. Or, in Adorno's formulation, "Sanctioned illusions allow a dispensation from comparison with reality." Thus error creates a reality of its own, for the very act of contemplation is colored by the norms of conduct imposed on the contemplator: cultural values are intricately related to intellectual activity, interest is inevitably reflected in thought. Thought itself must in consequence be viewed sociologically, each subculture promoting a particular and limited image of the social whole from which its inhabitants derive meanings and interpretations. For this reason, "...the products of the cognitive process are..differentiated because not every possible aspect of the world comes within the purview of the members of a group...."[7]

Neo-Feminism and Consciousness-Raising

The first level of activity in any challenge to institutional verities involves the process of unmasking. Thus neo-feminists begin with a bill of particulars relative to the unjust and the insupportable. Raising the consciousness of adherents then includes an examination of given codifications of reality. In the realm of the psyche, this has meant an analysis of the weight of social expectation that burdens women to be feminine pawns rather than female persons: a scrutiny of non-genetic conditioning parameters. From this has come the rediscovery that woman, in the words of Judith Murray "experiences a mortifiying consciousness of inferiority which embitters every enjoyment."[8] The intellectual, emotional, character, interest profile imposed by the feminine subculture are documents, the tools of socialization, the systems of persuasion and coercion that ensure results are dissected out. But there seems to be an underlying assumption that awareness in itself can transform determinal nurturance, that contemporary women have only to bite into the apple of feminism, have only to "know" in order to be free.

The difficulty is that nay disadvantaged group internalizes a skewed reality. "What the human mind makes of the sense data, and thinks about, is always a created thing" notes Jacob Bronowski. Each of us looks at the total spectrum of possibilities through a particular window. This means that the intellectual landscape is framed into a pattern with invisible boundaries; looking at life through the window of the feminine subculture, implies the acquisition of a perspective that has become second nature. Without doubt the unused aptitudes and capacities of first nature con-

tinue to exist -- but awareness alone does not release them. Too many layers of indoctrination insulate new consciousness from old custom. Group norms "not only determined to a large extent the avenues of approach to the surrounding world, but they also show at the same time from which angle and in which context of activity objects have hitherto been perceptible and accessible...."[9] Consciousness-raising is a technique for discovering the issues and focusing on the institutions that determine them. But there still remains the challenge of how newly-conscious women can overthrow the firth column in their heads, how they can alter their geography of the mind. Certainly, the grid of the world has changes for them, but, in a profound sense, they remain programmed by their prior condition.

Cognition and the Subculture

What then are these programmings? They are a comples of proffered patterns which, once internalized, produce corelative perceptions and proclivities. Style of life relates to style of cognition: humans not only create their envitonment, they are created by it. In the language of George Steiner, "...an organism adapts its hereditary potential to the demands and opportunities of the enviornment."[10] It is my position that the ecological inequality of women relative to the social environment stunts their hereditary potential: beyond the deflection of biography that occurs in the context of the feminine subculture, there is a contamination of psyche, an impact on sensibility that distorts attitudes and processes requisite for first-rate reflection. It might even be maintained that all too often there follows a "trained incapacity to deal with problems of the mind."[11]

Caroline Bird has observed that women are the only underprivileged group that lives with the elite. But, in the framework of the sociology of knowledge, women do not share a common world with that elite either in terms of social experience of individual cognition. Indeed, the functional differentiation imposed by the society assumes a polarity in qualities and a dichotomy in tasks that would debar women from exerting what Mannheim has called the intellectual mastery of life problems -- not only in the segment of reality allotted to the elite, but even in their own allotted segment: the sexual ghetto. We have been innured to the division of the world into the sex that thinks and the sex that feels. "Woman's whole soul," it has been affirmed, "conscious and unconscious, is best conceived as a magnificent organ of heredity and to its laws all her psychic activities, if unperverted, are true."

Now "It does not follow from the fact that human beings are different from other objects," remarks Louis Wirth, "that there is nothing determinate about them."[12] It is my thesis that the complex of social ideas designated as appropriate for women, and the subculture which functions as the medium through which these ideas are diffused put a premium on irrationality, depreciate the value of thought. In consequence, the inexact mode has come to characterize the female mind. On the other hand, "...opportunity for relative emancipation from social determinism."[13] An analysis of the qualities, activities, and areas of awareness developed in the feminine subculture may illuminate the extent of social determinism in the patterns

female thought.

Thought Inappropriate

First there is, as already suggested, the inappropriateness of thought itself. In the old language, it addled woman's feeble brain. Not long ago, maidens were urged not to worry their pretty little heads about that. And today, the better half is pressed to use her "pacific instincts" to save a world made unliveable by the sophisticated reasoning of the sex in power.* Whether the denial of cognitive ability is voiced with positive or negative valence is not material to my thesis that the social model for woman implies no capacity for clear thought. "My works in her mind," wrote James Joyce, "cold polished stones sinking through a quagmire."[14]

This is ratified by philosophers, as for example, Hegel:

"Women may be educated, true, but they are not created for the higher sciences, philosophy and certain branches of art..." He goes on, "When a woman stands at the head of a state that state finds itself in danger. They act...according to change whim and chance fancy."[15]

And it is ratified by psychologists, as for example, Helene Deutsch in her major work, The Psychology of Woman:

"For intuition is God's gift to the feminine woman; everything relating to exploration and cognition, all the forms and kinds of human cultural aspiration that requires a strictly objective approach, are... the domain of the masculine intellect,...against which woman can rarely compete."[16]

And it is ratified, with primary certitude, by the popular culture:

"Women are irrational,
That's all there is to that.
Their heads are full of cotton, hay and rags."[17]

---

* Virginia Woolf, reacting to this kind of reasoning, wrote: "But a desire to worship woman as a higher moral influence tends, in real life, to restrict her freedom almost as much as a conviction of her inferiority." Herbert Marder, Feminism and Art (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968) p. 14.

The Pattern of the Private

But the model does not only project an image; it imposes a pattern: the pattern of the private, for the dichotomy of the traditional model for woman assigns the public world of work and politics to man, the private world of limited familial reality to woman.. This is extremely significant in relation to cognition, for, in the words of Hannah Arendt:

"To live an entirely private life means above all to be deprived of things essential to a truly human life: to be deprived of the reality that comes from being seen and heard by others, to be deprived of an "objective" relationship with them that comes from being related to and separated from them through the intermediary of a common world of things, to be deprived of the possibility of achieving something more permanent than life itself. The privation of privacy lied in the absence of others;...it is as though he did not exist."[18]

She also noted that those living in such social isolation "are all imprisoned in the subjectivity of their own singular experience, which does not cease to be singular if the same experience is multiplied innumerable times."[19] What the private person does remains without significance or consequence to others. In this sense, the privat hemisphere assigned to woman makes her socially invisible and socially irrelevant. This is relevant to intellectual capacity for, according to Harry Stack Sullivan, the self is composed of the reflected appraisals of others, and, in the formulation of Ruth Benedict, no individual can arrive even at the threshold of potential ability without a culture in which to participate. This leads women to the feminine subculture and to the development of those potentialities which are viable, there, its rules being encoded in the very circuitry of the woman's nervous system. But these traits are, by the same token, those which the wider culture does not value. In that sense, women remain socially disenfranchised and psychologically deviant.

The pattern of the private is relevant to the female mind not only in terms of traits developed, but also in terms of activities imposed. These involve an agenda of buying and bedecking, of preening and procuring, of gracing and garnering, focusing on what Richard Howard has called the "fatal etcetera of things" and Edith Wharton a "life-long mastery over trifles."

In contrast, thinking,* according to Buckminster Fuller, "is the result of removing irrelevancies, a few at a time, selectively, until only the relevant remains." [20] In the same vein, Arthur Koestler notes in The Act of Creation, "the principle of parsimony seems to be an essential factor in mental progress."[21] And Bergson refers to "the

---

*"Why," asks Henry Higgins in My Fair Lady is thinking something women never do?/ Why is lobid never tried?/ Straghtening up their hair is all they ever do,/ Why don't they straighten up the mess that's inside?"

mechanical encrusted on the living" which is the result, in Koestler's view, of protracted confinement to the Trivial Plane.[22] Thus higher levles of consciousness are not freed for more challenging tasks and the grammar of existence tends to become narrow and final, tied to the inessential and the self-evident.

Distraction and Discontinuity

The feminine subculture also majors in distraction and discontinuity. Now it need scarcely be said that in creative thought the problem one seeks to solve is continually in focus, and reflection concerning it must be concentrated and intense.

Melville writes:

"...to most of the great works of humanity, their authors had given not weeks and months, not years and years, but their wholly surrendered dedicated lives."

And Rilke:

"Without duties, almost without external communication, unconfined solitude which takes every day like a life, a spaciousness which puts no limit to vision..."

These are conditions precedent, prerequisites, to the art of meditation, yet what woman's life can achieve such an "undistracted center of being?"**

Tillie Olsen, citing the above, and pointing to the circumstances of women's lives which are antithetical to the needs of creation, observes:

"But women are traditionally trained to place other's needs first, to feel these needs as their own...their sphere their staisfaction to be in making it possible for others to use their abilites." And she concludes, "unused capacities atrophy, cease to be."[23]

Rigor, Science, and the Sexual Ghetto

But, to be sure, it is necessary to have solid input, to have something to reflect with, to intensely concentrate on. Here the narrow range of feminine learning (differential enculturation) which has kept women outside the rigorous disciplines and confined them to the sexual ghetto of the "Humanities" means that they are often "Without the hard little bits of marble which are called "facts" or "data" necessary to compose a mosaic.[24] For, to be an original thinker means to bridge two matrices, to span two orders of ideas not formerly connected. Intuition certainly comes into this process, but information is essential; one cannot join matrices one does not know. This is particularly significant

---

**The phrase is from Paul Valery.

in relation to the tradition that has kept women isolated from scientific method and scientific throught, for, in Bronowski's formulation, "We live in a world which is penetrated through and through by science...."[25] Woman's place in the academic milieu sets her apart from study connected with the objective and the verifiable. There is, in consequence, little corrective to the world of private consciousness to which the sex has traditionally been relegated, and a gap is created both in awareness and in methodology between the intuitive leap and the corrected concept.

This is not to say that those disciplines that approach the subjective-emotional are less valuable than the others. Only that strict thought tethered to unyielding data offers a window on the world that differs in kind from the more malleable, semantic fields. The truth must not merely be attained by reason; it must be framed with the highest degree of precision. To have no comprehension of science in a civilization powered by it, in the philosophical as well as the technological sense, is to be debarred from its reality. For ours "is the only living species which has altered its ecological patterning in the history of life on earth."[26] We have moved, reports Buckminster Fuller, "from a sweepout of perhaps a 24 mile radius to intersteller space."[27] Yet, in an intellectual sense, most women, even academic women are scientifically illiterate, symbolically still living in terms of the craft concepts of the individual naked in the the wilderness, conceptually still roaming in terms of a narrow geography.

William James once wrote to his brother Henry, "I have to forge every sentence in the teeth of irreducible and stubborn facts."[28] The scientific perspective has, according to Whitehead, recolored our mentality. "This new tinge to modern minds is a vehement and passionate interest in the relation of general principles to irreducible and stubborn facts."[29] But the assumed irrationality of women has separated them from this vital manifestation of reason, from the imaginative content and the exquisite knowledge extensions that have altered the grid of the world. In this sense, they are socially and intellectually signed off from their civilization. For it has been said, "Our older theories contribute no more to predictive power than astrology." The perceptions they foster are tied essentially to "myth and totem" consolidated by tradition.*[30] George Steiner has written, "A scientific revolution is an act of motion. The mind leaves one major door of perception, one great window, and turns to another."[31] Women are still programmed to look at the universe through the pre-scientific window of an earlier age.

---

*I should make it clear that in deploring the fact that women are outsiders in the scientific disciplines I am not referring either to <u>scientism</u> (a mechanical mania for quantification and idiot experiment without concern for content) or technology (the application or misapplication of scientific information). I refer to the scientific method and the vantage of scientific inquiry.

Conservatism and Docility

Further, the conservatism and docility engrained in women (don-
fidence in the expert, insufficient skepticism) incapacitates them
from another prerequisite for significant thought, that boldness which
dares to transpose given, accepted patterns of ideas.

"Of all forms of mental activity, the most difficult to induce, even in the minds of the young, who may be presumed not to have lost their flexibility, is the art of handling the same bundle of data as before, but placing them in a new system of relations with one another by giving them a different framework, all of which virtually means putting on a different kind of thining cap for the moment."[32]

Women are invited to engage in patient effort at the expense of originality. Imitation tends to eclipse innovation as received models are dutifully internalized. Thus, maintained in ego uncertainty**by the subculture, women walk forward in the tried shoes of familiar forms. And yet, the foundation of new thought is skepticism.

Changing the Reality Level

New effort to make women aware of their matrix and its snares and delusions, is, as I have suggested, a first step. But the prejudices and impurities incorporated in the feminine universe cannot be excised by consciousness alone, it is necessary to shift the frame of that universe. After patterning is recognized, programming must be altered. The process is a challenging one but it can be achieved.

Marshall McLuhan suggest one technique:

"...one has to get outside the environment or sensory models of one's own culture in order to understand anything at any time...because the natural form of culture is to brainwash all the members of that culture. Anybody who is adjusted to any culture is brainwashed....One of the quickest ways of discovering the nature of your own little prison or trap is the speed of succession as you move from one (culture) to another, almost like the frames of a film; then you suddenly become aware of the fact that the world you are living in has very definite ground rules, and that you can get outside them."[33]

**"I noticed in those fellow-students of the liberal arts that they never learned enough about anything to be certain about it. They finished as they went in: doubtful, insecure, still not knowing where to go. But I had chemistry. Chemistry is not a skill -- it is a point of view, it's a citadel, it's a whole intellectual structure against which one can measure other intellectual structures. This is a home from which a man can have a view of the world." I. I. Rabi, Center Diary #18, May-June 1967 Center for Study of Dem. Institutions.

More profoundly, Karl Mannheim writes:

"Perhaps it is precisely when the hitherto concealed dependence of thought on group existence and its rootedness in action becomes visible that it really became possible for the first time, through becoming of them, to attain a new mode of control over previously uncontrolled factors of thought."[34]

After consciousness raising comes consciousness changing. It is necessary to recognize, as Loren Eiseley so sensetively remarks, that "We too, like the generations before us, are the cracked, the battered, the amlformed products of remoter chisels shaping the most obstinate substance in the universe."[35] the human species. And, having perceived this determinism, it is essentail to carve out a new cognitive pattern, a new female mind freed from the anatomic destingy of the feminine subculture.

---

(1) The Equality of the Sexes and the Condition of Women, (1838), quoted by Adrienne Koch, "The Consequences of Equality," in The Potential of Woman, ed. Seymour M. Farber and Roger H. L. Wilson, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1963, p. 204.

(2) The Children of Sanchez, Random House, New York, 1961, P. xxiv

(3) Richard Hoggart, The Uses of Literacy, Pelican Books, London, 1958, p

(4) Karl Manheim, Ideology and Utopia, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1936, pp. 2-3.

(5) Ibid., p. 16

(6) Ibid., p. 22

(7) Ibid., p. 29

(8) Aileen Kraditor, Up From the Pedestal, Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1968, p. 33.

(9) Ideology and Utopia, p. 2.

(10) George Steiner, The New Yorker, March 6, 1971.

(11) Ideology and Utopia, p. 24.

(12) Introduction to Ideology and Utopia, p. xix.

(13) Ideology and Utopia, pp. 47-48.

(14) Mary Ellmann, quoting from Giacomo Joyce, in Thinking About Women, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1968, p. 107.

(15) F. W. Hegel, "Principles of the Philosophy of Law"

(16) 2 vols., Grunet Stratton, 1944, New York, vol. I, p. 290, etseq.

(17) Henry Higgins in the musical, My Fair Lady.

(18) The Human Condition, University of Chicago, Press, Chicago, 1958, p. 58.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Ideas and Integrities, Prentice Hal l, New Jersey, 1963.

(21) Macmillan, New York, 1964, pp. 154, 155.

(22) Ibid., p. 363.

(23) "Silences," Harper's Magazine, October, 1965, p. 160.

(24) Arthur Koestler, The Act of Creation, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1964, p. 235.

(25) Science and Human Values, The Nation, December 29, 1956.

(26) Ideas and Integrities, p. 305.

(27) Ibid.

(28) quoted by Alfred North Whitehead in Science and the Modern World, The Free Press, New York, 1967, p. 3. (First published in 1925).

(29) Ibid.

(30) John Wilkinson, "Second Edition/The Quantitative Society," The Center Magazine, vol. II, no. 4 (July, 1969), p. 71, published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California.

(31) George Steiner, The New Yorkers, March 6, 1971

(32) Arthur Koestler, The Act of Creation, quoting Butterfield in his History of the Scientific Revolution, p. 235.

(33) "Dialogue with Marshall McLuhan," Bulletin of the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, February, 1966.

(34) Ideology and Utopia, p. 5.

(35) Loren Eiseley, The Mind as Nature, Harper and Row, New York, 1962, p. 27.

SEXISM IN TEXTBOOKS

Dolores Barracanto Schmidt

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," --men, of course, includes women, or does it? Do women have equal rights and equal representation in education? Is each individual in the educational system in the United States today being encouraged to develop to her or his full potential? Education includes not only skills and knowledge but a sense of self, the development of a self-image. It is important that each student come to an understanding of her or his full worth in an atmosphere which is free from bias, which does not classify without regard to individual preference and aptitude, which does not assume restrictions without providing opportunities. No educator would dispute these goals, yet study after study indicates that the female student at every age-level is being pre-judged, routed into a stereotyped sex role without ever being given a chance to discover who she really is, what she is really capable of. Thus the Dean of the School of Nursing at the University of Pittsburgh recently bemoaned the fact that in each entering class of nurses, there are always two or three women who, by every criteria of testing, counseling, and past performance should have been encouraged to go to medical school. Inevitably, a little girl interested in medicine is encouraged to play nurse, not doctor. Society encourages the attitude that marriage is her true destiny, why waste years of work and all that money educating a girl to be a doctor? And last, but no least, the books she is exposed to from nursery school through college do not encourage free development of her potential, but insist on her subordinate, dependent role, taking orders, advice, leadership from a strong male figure. Here are the results of several recent studies, any one of which can explain why our potential doctor ends up being a nurse, probably a not very happy one, under-utilized as she will be.

(1) The dictionary edictors at American Heritage and Houghton Mifflin undertook a study of all the words -- five million of them -- in the textbooks used by American school children in grades three through nine. Census figures place women at between 51 and 53% of the total population, so we may assume that in the average classroom of a coeducational school, women and men will be about equally divided. According to the word count, "the word boy or boys appears 4,700 times versus 2,200 for girl or girls. Of the 20 given names most frequently used 13 were male, headed by John, and only 7 were female, led by, of course, Mary. And in all family relationships - brother-sister, son-daughter, uncle-aunt, grandfather-grandmother -- the male work was dominant except in two cases. Wife and mother appeared more often than husband and father." In essence, grades 3 through 9 are taught quite clearly that it is a man's world despite the persistence in reality of a majority of females. Note that wife and mother appear more often than husband and father, for men are too busy being doctors, engineers, aviators to be seen much at home assuming responsible domestic relationships. Women, however, are wives and mothers, period. They are not wives, mothers and doctors;

wives, mothers, and architects; wives, mothers, and teachers, though, again, the facts indicate that working mothers are by no means uncommon in our society.

(2) FEMINISTS ON CHILDREN'S MEDIA conducted an analysis of books from the 15 most widely-used series of elementary school readers. In a total of 144 readers, there are 881 boy-centered stories (72%) as compared with 344 girl-centered stories. Another 282 stories center on adult males, as against 127 about adult females. There are 131 biographies of famous men, 23 of famous women. The study continues

> In the early grade readers the oldest child in a family is always a boy. Boys make things, earn, learn, play active games, romp with dogs, and help their fathers. Girls help their mothers or brothers, play with kittens, get into minor forms of trouble and are helped out by their brothers, and generally exhibit dependence, passivity, and domesticity.....Although at the fourth, fifth, and sixth grade levels boys in all series begin to look forward to manhood, girls are never found planning for their futures. Men are shown working at a variety of jobs, women are usually housewives.....They have no activities of their own apart from the family, and are never shown coming back home after some personal expedition.

(3) A study of highly-regarded childeren's fiction, the works on the list of "Notable Children's Books of 1969" issued by the American Library Association, the Child Study Association's recommendations for the same year, and all the winners of the Newberry Medal, an award given annually to the best children's book of the year reveals similar role chaneling. Since librarians rely heavily on these guides in purchasing books and recommending books to teachers and students, they can be assumed to be primary influences in determining what will be read in addition to textbooks. Boys outnumber girls by approximately 3 to 1 in the 49 Newbery Medal winners; 2 to 1 on the ASA list; the CSA list provided a similar ration.

(4) A study of eight children's books representing the winners and runner-ups of the Caldecott Award, an annual award presented by the Children's Service Committee of the American Library Association for the most distinguished picture book of the year, indicates that in the titles, fourteen males but only four females were listed by name. Of the characters pictured in illustrations, there were 386 females and 579 males. Of the eithgy books, there was not a single one that did not have a male (human or animal), but there were six books in which females were completely absent. In one-fourth of the entire sample there were only token females, mothers who sewed on the buttons and and packed the lunches so that, for example, "The Fool of the World,? could go away on his "flying ship," and Si could get a job as "Skipper John's Cook." As Aileen Nilsen, who conducted this study states

> I expected this but I was surprised to notice how often women and girls were pictured looking out at the action. They stand in doorways....they look through windows,....and they sit on the porch in rocking chairs....Most of the token females were very unobtrusive,

such as the princess who is only mentioned as a marriage objective.... There is one book in this groups that I think is the epitome of male chauvinism. It is an alphabet book called Ape in a Cape. It is dedicated to Timmy and it pictures thirty-six male animals and two females.

(5) A count of the Random House Landmark books, which are described as "colorful and dramatic chapters in American history," reveals that of the 165 books in print by 1970, only five were about individual American women.

(6) A fourth-grade text book on the history of Pennsylvania contains reference to only one woman--Betsy Ross. Another fourth grade text, Your Pennsylvania, mentions only two actual women by name: Deborah Read, whose one claim to fame was that Benjamin Franklin married her, and Marian Anderson, a supremely talented black woman, whose inclusion is probably an indication of PDE's Intergroup and Civil Rights Education sector preseure.

(7) A study of women in a dozen of the most popular United States history textbooks presently being used at the high school level reveals a "curious pattern of inclusions and neglects, a pattern which presents the stereotyped picture of the American woman--passive, incapable of sustained organization or work, satisfied with her role in society, and well supplied with material blessings." Granted that history texts are necessarily selective, this study calls into question what that basis of selection might be when it applies to the history of women in America. Who decides and why that Carrie Nation is more important than Margaret Sanger? That women whose reforms were in the field of nursing care--Clara Barton, Dorothea Dix--are more important than those who campaigned for labor reforms? As Janice Law Trecker reasonably concludes

> Althought it is tempting to imagine some historical autocrat sternly decreeing who's in and who's out--giving space to Harriet Beecher Stowe but not to Marianne Moore; to Dorothea Dix but not Mary Bickerdyke; to Pocohontas bµt not Margaret Brent; to Susan B. Anthony but not Abigail Duniway--the omission of many significant women is probably not a sign of intentional bias. The treatment of women simply reflects the attitudes and prejudices of society. Male activities in our society are considered the more important; therefore male activities are given primacy in the texts. There is a definite image of women in our society, and women in history who conform to this image are more apt to be included.

(8) In a study of 27 top-selling textbooks designed for college survery courses in American history representing 4-5 million dollars a year in sales, of the sixty authors listed, only 1 is a woman--and that book is now out of print! The study tabulated all references to women, comparing the total number of pages of each text to the number of pages devoted to women and the total number of illustrations in each text to the number depicting women. In the survey texts, rangin from 400 to over 2000 pages, the space devoted to women and the total number of

illustrations in each text to devoted to women varies from a high of 2% to an infinitesimal 5/100ths of 1%. Predictably, in illustrated texts, women are seen far more frequently than they are written about, claiming as much as 6% of the total number of illustrations. Thus, in one book, only 6 of the 1830 pages discuss women (1/3 of 1%) but 4 of 76 pictures (over 5%) are of women, those insignificant but decorative creatures, 15 times more appealing to the eye than to the mind. Nor is it the lack of female historical figures that is responsible for this. One text, for example, mentions reform of insane asylums in the first half of the 19th century without reference to Dorothea Dix, muck-raking with no word of Ida Tarbell, and the Montgomery bus system boycott totally omitting Rosa Parks. In the 27 books, the only mention made of Martha Washington describes her shock, after a presidential reception, at finding a greasy mark on the wallpaper--an image of American womenhood surely better suited to T.V. commercials than to college classrooms. 89% of the texts, however, do mention Peggy Eaton and Harriet Beecher Stow, making these two women the most important female in American history! It is interesting, indeed, when one considers the role of textbooks in reinforcing female stereotypes, that the women most likely to be discussed are those deemed responsible for bringing on the Civil War--unintentionally, of course! Eve, Helen, and our very own Peggy Eaton, a beauty of questionable reputation whose social ambitions supposedly fired sectional strife, and Harriet Beecher Stowe, one of the "mob of scribbling women" immortalized by Abraham Lincoln as "the little lady who started the big war." What of those women who <u>really</u> changed the quality of life in America, women who could serve as positive role models for college undergraduates? What of Margaret Sanger, whose efforts to free the American wife from the bondage of annual childbearing caused her to be reviled and jailed? What of Jeanette Rankin, who first made women visible in the operations of the federal government, a female voice for peace heard in this country from the first World War to Viet Nam? What of Eleanor Roosevelt, a staunch advocate of civil rights, a woman who proved that marriage to a very important man does not prevent one from maintaining a separate identity? They are, for the most part, absent from the history history textbooks. Eleanor Roosevelt, mentioned, if at all, as an asset to her husband, her humanitarian instincts and activities reduced to political machinations calculated to get her husband votes. And though she continued to be a significant voice for the civil rights movement and for keeping the Democratic Party on its toes regarding its obligations to minorities for many years after FDR's death, she disappeares from the history texts long before he does. Nor are women credited for bringing about dramatic changes in standards of living. One text states, "High school education for the children of workers became common....class differentation in clothing was reduced as mass-produced garments improved in quality, declined in price, and closely imitated the simplified fashions of the wealthy. Foreign observers were deeply impressed by the rarity of "class-consciousness"....among American workers." The writers are speaking of the 1920's by which time both elementary and secondary school systems had long been staffed almost entirely by educated, dedicated, underpaid women, and it was their less educated, less fortunate sisters who had made the triumph of the American ready-to-wear clothing

industry possible. The authors fail to mention these latter facts, a failure shared by the authors of 95% of the other texts in this study.

(9) The college curriculum in literature and composition is equally male-oriented. According to Elaine Showalter, in the 21 courses beyond the freshman level offered by the English department of a woman's college, there were listed 313 male writers and 17 women writers. A check of some standard two-volume anthologies reveals a similar imbalance: the Korton Anthology, for example, includes 169 men and 6 women: American Poetry and Prose lists 86 men and 10 women. A freshman anthology with the title Representative Men: Cult Heroes of Our Time discusses 38 men and two women. Though the men represent a broad range of achievements, the two women are Elizabeth Taylor and Jacqueline Onassis, one a sex symbol, the other defined largely in terms of the men she married.

The implications of these studies is clear, the implications of the texts themselves even clearer. They are teaching women, girls from the age they first start looking at picture-books to the time they graduate from college, that women don't do things. They don't do important things; they don't do exciting things/ they are present only to make it possible for men to do such things. A women doesn't write poetry, she inspires a man to write it. She doesn't participate in major sports, she cheers the men on to vitory. She doesn't make decisions leading to significant social changes, she accidentally starts wars. And, of course, she doesn't perform an operation, she hands a surgeon the scalpel. It may seem rather far-fetched to blame the under-achievement of women on a book looked at by a child who doesn't even read yet, but the following true anecdote recounted by Allenn Nilsen, cute and naive as it may sound, indicates how early the concept of limited opportunities for women is absorbed, how difficult a problem countering it will be, and what a magnificent challenge to aware educators it offers:

> Last summer....my sister was accepted into medical school. Naturally, there were congratulations and comments from neighbors, friends, and relatives. After a few days of this, she found her son (age six, and her daughter (age five) crying real tears for no apparent reason. When she at last got to the cause of their grief, she found that they thought, if she were going to become a doctor, she would first have to turn into a man and they wouldn't have a mother.

Educators undoubltedly are key figures in the shaping of the aspirations of the young, and textbooks define much of what will and what will not be taught in the classroom. It is, therefore, imperative, if we truly want to make equal education and opportunity for women a reality that we review textbooks and curricula for sexist bias.

TEXTBOOK MONITORING PROJECT
PWR-PDE COMMITTEE ON SEXISM IN TEXTBOOKS

In an effort to equalize educational opportunities for women in Pennsylvania, PWR and PDE have joined together to study the nature and frequency of sexism in books and other curricular material currently in use in Commonwealth schools. We would greatly appreciate your taking a few minutes to fill out the following form if you discover any books which (a) under-represent the contributions of women; (b) relegate women to inferior, submissive roles; (c) discuss sex differences, i.e., intelligence, intuition, aggression, achievement levels as other than the result of cultural conditioning. We would also like you to report on materials which, in your opinion, offer fair expositions of the potential and accomplishments of women.

TITLE OF BOOK_____

AUTHOR_____

PUBLISHER_____

YEAR OF PUBLICATION_____ EDITION_____

Is this book currently in use in a Commonwealth school?_____

If so, SCHOOL_____

ADDRESS_____

COURSE OR GRADE IN WHICH BOOK IS USED_____

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME_____

If you have information as to how the selection of this book was made, i.e., instructor chose it, school board ordered it, etc., please give details:

_____

_____

State briefly the nature of the nature of the bias expressed, citing specific pages where possible, or quoting phrases and passages if appropriate:_____

_____

_____

Reviewer's Name_____

Address:_____

Return form to:

WOMEN'S STUDIES AS A SCHOLARLY DISCIPLINE:

Some Questions for Discussion

Susan S. Sherwin

I should like to address myself to the question of the curricula of Women's Studies programs as it realtes to the broader question of Women's Studies as a scholarly discipline. Let me begin with a series of questions that highlight this relationship, but for which I do not have fixed answers:

1. Should the function of Women's Studies programs be to stimualte, advertise and service couses offered by traditional academic departments, or should these programs take the lead in initiating, developing and teaching their own courses?

2. How do we get beyond the already overworked list of feminist books to lead to new, innovative courses and new research?

3. Are we seeking to create a separate framework of analysis with which to approach problems, or are we filling in--perhaps only temporarily--where our male counterparts have failed us?

4. These three questions lead us to the most basic questions: Is Women's Studies a distinct intellectual discipline? Must a feminist bring her field and her methodology to the study of women, or are we suggesting that there is a Feminist approach just as there are historical, sociological and literary approaches to human affairs?

These are troublesome questions, but they are questions which nevertheless must be kept in the forefront of any discussion about the curricula of a Women's Studies program. I have framed my own answers tentatively in the hope of stimulating further discussion.

Regarding the concept of Women's Studies as a clearing-house and stimulator of programs: We know that this is, indeed, the role of many programs, centers and institutes in universities all over the country. But even this limited function depends upon the availability of significant financial and human resources, resources that are too often lacking because women are so poorly represented in many departments on many campuses. We cannot be assured, for example, that there will be a course on Female Sexuality, or on Women in the Labor Force, or on the History of Feminism in the United States, unless a Women's Studies program has the financial resources and full-time academic positions to assure their existence.

I say this fully recognizing that some excellent courses have been offered on certain campuses. For example, a course on Women in History was recently offered by Professor Carl Dagler at Stanford, and other male scholars have been engaged in teaching and research in this field. This raises the question of men teaching feminism, which is perhaps a very separate discussion. But in terms of Women's Studies programs

teaching their own courses, we then have to deal with the questions: Who teaches? Who is qualified? How do we appraise somenone's feminist position? I shall not even attempt to answer these difficult questions now. If, in fact, a Women's Studies Program offers its own courses, perhaps these courses should be only interdisciplinary, since the nature of the subject is interdisciplinary itself. Perhaps we should try to develop a survey introductory course curriculum which might prove to be especially valuable for lower division students whom we want to reach and encourage. But, beyond that, does a student return to her chosen "field," often only to be discouraged in pursuing feminist topics in her reading and research?

This brings me to the second question: "how do we encourage new research and develop innovative courses?" In order to provide for those students who want to continue to develop their interests in Women's Studies, perhaps to become "feminist scholars," we might have to consider a major and a graduate field. The creation of a major involves more money, people and structure than most Women's Studies programs can offer at this point, but it could be a future priority. Since most universities are currently facing budget cuts and even hiring freezes, the implementation of a major would probably be most difficult. Yet many of the courses I am familiar with are only now scratching the surface in areas that are important to delve into in order to produce the articles, texts and journals necessary for the development envisaged. It is clear, I think, that if Women's Studies is to be generally accepted, we need the academic validity that comes with scholarly work. What we are doing and thinking may be revolutionary, but in this case, we are operating within the confines of academia and we should operate accordingly.

As to the question of separatism: We are all aware of this issuee as it developed with certain Black Studies Programs, and the difficulties and hostilities which ensued. I do not feel this is a viable approach; we are more than half the population, and our efforts to consolidate this "silent majority" are slowly succeeding. Within the university, as our voices grow louder and our numbers increase--with more women on the academic ladder--the new pressures will be unavoidable. There will be ideas for new courses in all directions. Indeed, we can all reel off course titles, and seminar suggestions, but these will always be relative to the individual talent available at a university, and also, the willingness of the Administration and/or departments to finance these courses. As feminists involved in Women's Studies we should encourage and endorse as many courses as possible with a wide range of subject matter. But I do not see that this can be dictated in any fashion, and I am not convinced to what degree we need to be apart from the already-existing disciplines. We should, however, try to resolve the conflict between developing a new framework of analysis and separatism.

This is all related to the more general and important question of Women's Studies as a discipline. It has been argued that all other scholarly work has been anti-feminist <u>de facto</u>, which implies that we would need to train feminists in each field. This is obviously an enormous task but the task is worth considering. In effect, we would have to try to define exactly what we mean by a discipline in order to

decide whether feminism is one. Personally I feel that the research methods of various already-established fields could be applied to the study of women, although I am aware that this poses problems for particular individuals where the power structure and tradition creates pressures against this. A pertinent analogy might be the plight of a Marxist in American universities: As an undergraduate, and especially as a graduate student, one is trained in historical research or literary criticism, for example; but if one's political ideology is Marxist, it will invariably affect one's work. In reality, we know that this Marxist critic, or historian often poses a threat to the "system" and has difficulties in maintaining his or her position. A feminist historian might indeed face the same predicament. Nonetheless, depending on how far we want to take this analogy, no "Marxist Studies" have been set up in a major university, as far as I know. At the least, therefore, Women's Studies programs should try to make funds available to those people who want to do research, or write theses and books in this area, whatever their field. These very people could be great resources to a program. Furthermore, we should discuss at length the concept and validity of a feminist discipline.

This can be done while discussing the future curricula for these programs, field by field, perhaps even topic by topic; there is a great deal of virgin (if you'll pardon the expression) territory! Do we take the lead and develop these courses, and produce the people to staff them, or do we see Women's Studies as a temporary, and therefore doomed program? Perhaps doom is unfair. If, in fact, we are talking about redress for our grievances against the male-dominated society, and if, in fact, the society changes (a great question-mark), then there might be no need for a separate program. In the meantime, however, let us talk more about specific development, about depth and breadth in feminist scholarship; let us recall what de Tocqueville said in Democracy in America (1840), "If I were asked ... to what the singular prosperity and growing strength of that people ought mainly to be attributed, I should reply: to the superiority of their women." The moment is with us; let us use it as fruitfully and as effectively as we can.

WOMEN AS SCAPEGOATS

Catharine R. Stimpson

A job for women's studies is to design new modes of perception and models of persons. A way of grasping action and character is to regard women as scapegoats.

Like many new feminists, I often test my theories against experience. The hazards are clear. Memory, like some tick sucking blood, grows bloated enough to englut reality itself. Emotion outshouts reason, confession governs study, any audience gets bored.

Nevertheless, let me talk about myself for a moment. For several years I had a classmate named Norma. Like every other child in my class, I loathed her. Physically, she was fat and ugly. She had gold-rimmed glasses and scabs on her legs. Mentally, she was tedious and sluggish. Emotionally, she was a clinger and a whiner. And legally, she was adopted. Everyone has at least one Norma hanging around -- a person who represents everything that we hope we are not, but everything that we fear we might be.

The class treated Norma offensively. We tried to expel her from our games, our parties, our secrets, even from the class itself. Individually or in groups, we went to our teachers -- in kindergarten, in the first grade, in the second grade -- to demand that Norma be transferred to another, less classy, school. No rebuff ever discouraged us.

Or, if we were angry, or frustrated, or guilty about some hidden sin, we attacked poor Norma. Sometimes we simply yelled at her. Sometimes we beat her up. To use an inept metaphor, she was our whipping boy. Denigrating and belittling her, we displaced our wretched feelings. (1)

The world has many scapegoats other than women. Literature does, too. For example, three novels with the title Scapegoat, their authors as diverse as Strindberg (1906), the English Jocelyn Brooke (1948), and Daphne duMaurier (1957), all have male protagonists. Yet I suggest that the way in which my schoolmates and I tormented Norma is a microcosm of the way in which society of ten treats women and writers a woman character.

Ironically, no matter how hard a group tries, it can never physically scourge women as a class. Even monasteries and male prisons must admit to the actual presence of women on the earth. The best one can do is to expel a woman from a community or to condemn every woman rhetorically. Ideology and the imagination, especially among misogynists, may flourish where pragmatism falters. The refractory daughters of Eve live on, but Eve, or Pandora, or that new viper, the modern mother, may be held culpable for the moral sins and physical evils humanity endures.

The vain effort to expel women wholly has one redeeming social virtue. Failure guarantees a sure supply of women to transmogrify into scapegoats.

No doubt the English had scapegoats before they had the word, which William Tindale gave to the language in 1530 in his translation of the Bible. Leviticus outlines the austere ritual of the Day of Atonement. Aaron, the brother of Moses, well washed, clad in linen, is to conduct a rite of purification. After presenting two goats to the Lord, he is to cast lets upon them.

> . . . the goat, on which the let fell
> to be the scapegoat, shall be presented
> live before the Lord, to make an
> attonement with him. (2)

Then, Aaron, both hands upon the head of the animal, is to confess over him the iniquities of the children of Israel before he is led into the wilderness. The goat will magically bear with him the transgressions and sins of the tribe, which will once again be fit, pure, and free, its moral ecology restored. As such, the story of the scapegoat, except for the beast, is a comic one.

Sir James Frazer, the The Golden Bough, has several rollicking anecdotes about scapegoating. He claims that the presence upon which sins may be discharged, as if they were some unwholesome fluid, may be an animal, a person, or a thing. A human scapegoat is often disfigured, theoretically a sign from god. The ritual of expulsion may be sporadic or periodical.

One of Frazer's examples is a gypsy tribe in Southern Europe. On Easter Sunday evening, its members put herbs and the carcass of a snake which everyone has touched into a wooden vessel wrapped in red and white wool. The oldest man in the tribe carries the dish from tent to tent until all the members of the tribe spit into it. After a sorceress has uttered some spells, the old man throws the vessel into running water. Not only does the village believe that it has dispelled the ills which otherwise would have afflicted it, but it assumes that anyone who does find and open the vessel will suffer the maladies which the tribe itself has so cleverly evaded.

Frazer also describes a Siamese practice: to single out a particularly lascivious woman, to carry her through the streets, to assault her verbally and to pelt her physically, and then to throw her on a dunghill, the symbol of expelled filth, or on a hedge of thorns, a symbol of sterile waste. The woman, who is both feminine and sexually excessive, is then forbidden ever to enter the city again. (3)

Many, of course, commonly think of Jesus Christ as most radiant of scapegoats. For all men he suffers all sins. Any character in Western literature, such as Cordelia, emanates Christ-like virtue, who endures Christ-like suffering, and who then breeds a Christ-like redemption, takes on the guise of the divine scapegoat. However, Christ has chosen his pain. The quotidian scapegoat has little or no choice in the matter. The choice that does matter is that of the community.

Shirley Jackson's "The Lottery," (1948) is perhaps the most succinct American fiction about human scapegoats as well as a tale of human sacrifice. The narrative tersely describes the morning of June 27th in a little New England village. Mr. Summers, a civic leader, and Mr. Graves, a postman, are conducting a lottery. Their surnames warn us of the alliance between seasonal fertility and necessary death.

Two drawings are held. The first for heads of families, the second for members of the family whose head has inadvertently drawn the marked ballot. The villagers have forgotten the source of their custom. Their children are happy and playful. However, as soon as they see that Mrs. Hutchinson is to be this year's victim, they all know what to do. As she cries, "It isn't fair, it isn't fair," they stone her to death. Even her little son throws pebbles.

Mr. Hutchinson might have drawn the slip as easily as his wife. Jackson uses a woman, not because she is making a sexual point, but because she is shocking a large audience. Our tender notions about motherhood, frail feminine flesh, and women's need for protection make us extremely vulnerable to the story of a woman's execution. Other books reveal a society in which women must be the scapegoats. Among them is Stephen Crane, Maggie: A Girl of the Streets (1893).

Crane, the compassionate moralist, who makes Maggie a victim, and Crane, the caustic realist, whose characters make Maggie a scapegoat, are separate voices. Crane, the craftsman, pulls them together. He sets the novel on the grim, scruffy Bowery in New York. His first scene is a rock fight between the urchins of Rum Alley and Devil's Row, the heirs of drunkards, brutes, and louts.

Maggie's family is no more ugly than any other: her mother a demon, her father a churl, both of them alcoholics, who let their anger fly at their children. The children, as weak and as dependent as many women, must submit to such abuse. Maggie, miraculously, eventually becomes a pretty young woman. She falls in love with Pete, a smug bartender, and begins to live with him. She acts, not out of greed, but out of need. For a young slum girl, a Pete is the only imaginable romantic escape from economic and emotional poverty.

In response, Maggie's family, or what is left of it, throws her out of their tenement home. She becomes a family scapegoat. Her mother calls her a "devil." Her brother, despite private doubts, publicly damns her so that "he might appear on a higher social plane." Maggie expiates, not only their sins, but their hopeless proletarianism.

Then Pete leaves Maggie for a bolder, flashier woman -- who happens to be a whore. In order to live, Maggie must herself become a whore. So doing, she exemplifies a large theme: the prostitute as scapegoat, whose fall from chastity makes the same arc as the push out of the communal circle. Crane, however, knows how little vocational choice his women have. Either they sew, or else they sell themselves so that men may sow wild oats.

Maggie suffers two more expulsions. First her neighbors, scoffing, yelling, as if they were players in a cruel, primitive rite, reject her. Crane, his

language at once concise and charged, describes the scene:

> Through the open doors curious eyes stared in at Maggie. Children ventured into the room and ogled her as if they formed the front row at a theatre. Women, without, bent toward each other and whispered, nodding their head with airs of profound philosophy.
>
> A baby, overcome with curiosity concerning this object at which are were looking, sidled forward and touched her dress, cautiously, as if investigating a red-hot stove. Its mother's voice rang out like a warning trumpet. She rushed forward and grabbed the child, casting a terrible look of indignation at the girl. (4)

Women, their loyalty to a particular culture rather than to other women, easily turn on another woman. But then Maggie, now "this object," has been reduced to the status of a thing which retains only the power to contaminate and to symbolize sexual contamination. Ironically, Crane manipulates the Christian imagery which runs throughout the novella. Maggie's dress, like a "red-hot stove," links her to hell. The mother's voice, ringing out "like a warning trumpet", links her to heaven. However, Crane ultimately links the community to hell and heaven to its inane garble.

Next, men as a class reject Maggie. A series of them refuse to sleep with her. In a brilliant, hallucinatory scene, she commits suicide. Taking her own life becomes her only mode of survival.

Even more clearly than a good novel, a pop novel, because of its vulgar simplicity, may anatomize our attitudes for us. Zane's Grey's anti-classic, The Code of the West (1934), is such a book. A formula novel which praises conservative values, it also points to the common mutual defense treaty drawn up between archaic forms and old-hat attitudes.

Mary Stockwell, a teacher, has immigrated to Tonto, Arizona. Boarding with the Thurmans, some rugged ranchers, who personify the Code of the West in technicolor, she has secretly fallen for Enoch Thurman, a budding patriarch. Then Mary's younger sister Georgiana, her name as redolent of feminine skittishness as Mary's of feminine stability, arrives in Tonto to fight off a well-deserved case of tuberculosis.

Cal Thurman, gulping and blushing, takes a yen to Georgiana. Unfortunately, she proves to be a hussy and a flirt. The tormented Cal hits her over the head, knocks her out, forces her to marry him, and locks her away in a remote, homemade mountain cabin. He does keep from raping her. Eventually, she repents and discovers that she loves Cal madly. Her moral and emotional growth find their climactic symbol, in a narrative otherwise somewhat short on climaxes, in her feeling of being one with nature -- trees, mountains, purple sunsets, and all.

Grey nails the coonskin of every modern sin to Georgiana. This moral burden helps to make her a scapegoat rather than a meddlesome alien. An Easterner, she carries the virus of urban life. A sexual adventurer in lipstick,

skimpy dresses, and rolled-down stockings, she challenges puritan mores. A materialist, she scrawls the graffiti of religious sketpicism on faith's rock of ages. A feminist, she defends women's rights. She even says:

> . . .we kids have got it figured out. We're wise. We see how our sisters and mothers and grandmothers have been buncoed by the lords of creation. By men! And we're not going to stand for it, see? We're going to do as we damn please, and if they don't like us they can lump us. But good night -- the proof is they like us <u>better</u>, if they don't know it. (5)

The leaders of the community plan to kick Georgiana out, to send her back East. The only thing that saves her is that she expels the old bad Georgiana herself. In a passage some might call obsequious, she vows to become a good new Georgiana:

> She had been more than vain, selfish, thoughtless, cruel. She had been blind, weak, wicked . . . in Georgiana formed the nucleus of a revolt. It was not a pity that Cal Thurman had the character to fight for her. The world was a better place when men fought for women, even if it was a matter of possession. The pity was that she, and all her kind, were not worth it. . . She knew she would never rest, never have any peace, until she had corrected what was wrong. (6)

Being a scapegoat is hardly the only fate our common imagination gives to women. Very different is that of the ideal, the pure, the good. Except for gestures of maternity and mercy, she remains a still center of benign being. How much can any figure move on top of a pedestal?

Very different, too, is the mad, bad, dangerous woman, the siren, the witch, the vampire, the Medusa, a Lilith, La Belle Dame Sans Mercy, Dolores Our Lady of Sensual Pain. This romantic figure, whom brave men must approach, even at their doom, surges out of control. The scapegoat is not only out of control, but a way to control the uncontrollable.

Despite all this, despite the fact that Americans have despised the blacks, the Jews, the Orientals, and the poor more than women, the latter are popular scapegoats. One explanation may be the fact that women and scapegoats share two attributes: mystery (that they should serve the community as they do verges on the miraculous) and passivity (that they do serve the community as they should shows real weakness). We often thriftily dole out the same treatment to similar characters.

Another explanation is the fact that so many women have so often had so little legal, economic, political, cultural, and physical power. One woman has been unable to turn back any group intent on making her a scapegoat. Held inferior to men, they have been easier to despise than equals or superiors. If they are dependent upon men, they arouse resentment, because they are a burden, or anxiety, because they may be too much of a burden. If they are

independent of men, they may arouse hostility of both men and women, because they have broken away from acceptable roles. In brief, getting rid of women often means getting hold of a little peace.

If a man wishes to turn a woman into his private scapegoat, the public, which might condemn him, never has to know what is going on. Domestic bowers conceal bullies, and traditional husbands have free rein. It is interesting to recall that in old English common law, a woman who murdered her husband was charged with treason, petty treason to be sure, but treason nevertheless. Moreover, as John Stuart Mill pointed out:

> . . .everyone who desires power, desires it most over those who are nearest to him, with whom his life is passed, with whom he has most concerns in common, and in whom any independence of his authority is oftenest likely to interfere with his individual preferences. (7)

Of course women are written about in debasing ways because of the demands of ideology (for example, the writings of the Patristic fathers); of genre (for example, the Medieval débats about women); and of theme (for example, the shrew). Even when every allowance is made for the ways in which literature shapes literature, an unsavory truth remains: women are scapegoats in art because they are easily scapegoated in life.

The iconoclastic twentieth-century has left the image of the scapegoated woman unbroken. Modern psychology makes much of the alleged masochism of women. Freud theorizes:

> The suppression of women's aggressiveness which is prescribed for them constitutionally and imposed on them socially favours the development of powerful masochistic impulses, which succeed, as we know, in bidding erotically and destructive trends which have been diverted inwards. (8)

Marie Bonaparte, heir to both Freud and Helene Deutsch, writes:

> . . .woman, above all, remains always more or less dominated by her positive, passive, masochistic Oedipus complex. (9)

She even believes the sperm's penetration of the ovum to be a sadistic act perpetrated upon a wounded, masochistic egg. Perhaps her most vulgar moment is to cite, as evidence of women's masochism, the popular saying that women like to be beaten. Mickey Spillane lives on in academic drag.

The effect of such pseudo-scientists as Bonaparte is to encourage women to keep on accepting suffering -- their own and that of others.

Modern writing may speak only for modern writers. An alien, an exile, even a Cain, the modern writer's values may be his, and his alone. Yet he often makes a woman his scapegoat with a joyous vitriol an older, more socially comfortable, writer may lack. Living apart from his culture himself, he can

hardly expel women from it. What he can do is to cast her away from the pantheon of his art, the temple of his moral scheme, the elect group of his soul's society.

An example of this pattern is The Great Gatsby (1925). Fitzgerald, through his narrator Nick Carraway, asks us to see Daisy clearly. Gatsby reveres her as his vision incarnate, even after her marraige to Tom Buchanan, Ur Fascist. When Gatsby is shot, Daisy is morally responsible for his death. Society protects her. The privilege of class and the power of wealth shelter her from a just retribution. Yet Fitzgerald unmasks her. He makes her a symbol of modern corruption and destructiveness, a character whom Nick Carraway abandons.

An earlier, more complex study of the struggle between the artist and society over the feminine scapegoat is The Scarlet Letter (1850). Hawthorne first deliberately makes himself a scapegoat. Writing about seventeenth-century, Puritan New England, he mentions that his ancestors had been among its most rigid rulers. One had persecuted the Quakers, especially the Quaker woman Anne Hutchinson. Another had persecuted the witches of Salem. Hawthorne concludes that their crimes have hurt the family. For the sake of the family, he declares:

> . . . (I) hereby take shame upon myself for their sakes and pray that any curse incurred by them -- as I have heard . . . may be now and henceforth removed. (10)

Then Hawthorne takes as his heroine Hester Prynne, a community scapegoat. The citizens of Boston have expelled her from their town. She has broken the laws of the land, of sexual restraint, and femininity. Women, perhaps because Hester will carry with her the sins which they might commit, are among her most gleeful tormentors. The ugliest, the most pitiless, of them shouts:

> This woman has brought shame upon us all, and ought to die. Is there not law for it? Truly, there is, both in the Scripture and the statute-book. (11)

Hester, who even lives in a little hut outside of town, diligently works at being a scapegoat. So doing, she works out her salvation.

Hawthorne is as clearly for Hester as he is against Boston. He exculpates the one scapegoat, who accepts her error, to accuse the many scapegoaters, who evade theirs. Tney, of course, pay the price of spiritual corruption and psychological misery. Hester never becomes a perfect woman. Hawthorne finds her too aggressive, meddlesome, and earthy for that. Yet his preference for her is more than a moral choice. The Scarlet A symbolizes craft and beauty. Made of fine red cloth, it is "surrounded with an elaborate embroidery and fantastic flourishes of gold thread." Praising Hester, the artful sinner, Hawthorne praises Hawthorne, the artist who takes on sin, perhaps because he fears his art itself may be a sin.

A powerful modern voice will have none of this. D. H. Lawrence, in Studies in Classic American Literature (1932) dissects Hawthorne and denounces

Hester, whom he regards as some cross between Everywoman and an octopus. Hawthorne, Lawrence says, secretly hates Hester. Certainly Lawrence does. On to her fictive presence he projects all that he finds horrible and diabolic about women. His language, as he speaks of humanity's survival, is that of a man in extremis.

According to Lawrence, Hester, disguised as a meek saint, is a murderess. Thought to be pure, she is filthy. Flaunting "understanding," she will really thrust Lawrence's fabled blood-consciousness into an iron coffin and keep in there. In fierce, colloquial, paranoid prose, Lawrence roars:

> Hester lives on, pious as pie, being a public nurse. She becomes at last an acknowledge saint . . . She would, being a woman. She has had her triumph over the individual man, so she quite loves subscribing to the whole spiritual life of society . . . woman is a strange and rather terrible phenomenum, to man. When the subconscious soul of woman recoils from its creative union with man, it becomes a destructive force . . . The devil is in her.
>
> The very women who are most busy saving the bodies of men, and saving the children: these women-doctors, these nurses, these educationalists, these public-spirited women, these female saviours: they are all, from the inside, sending out waves of destructive malevolence which eat out the inner life of a man, like a cancer. (12)

Lawrence, who would be chilling if he were not so childish, stops being a prosecuting attorney to become the hanging judge. Men, he asserts, must beat women back into a deep submission. "Give her a slap," he urges.

> Give her the great slap . . . just when she is being most angelic . . . you've got to fight her, and never give in. She's a devil . . . But in the long run she is conquerable. And just a tiny bit of her wants to be conquered. You've got to fight three-quarters of her, in absolute hell, to get at that final quarter of her that wants a release, at last, from the hell of her own revenge. (13)

Lawrence sums up much modern literary advice to those in search of a scapegoat. Take women; blame them; try to get rid of them, and since you can't do that, smash them to bits.

Like the plangent Norman Mailer, like the surly Frederick Exley, he also dramatizes an odd twist in modern literature. Male writers tend to transfer to women both those things which they most fear, which they believe will most harm them, and those ideals which they most crave, which they believe will most redeem them. In The Second Sex Simone deBeauvoir discusses this brilliantly. (14)

The more they have sought the spirit and an ascetic ideal, the more they have made women both virgin angels and whorish devils who indulge nature, the flesh, and the delights of sex. A Medieval priest compares women to a painted tombstone which concels a rotting corpse. Saul Bellow, in Mr. Sammler's Planet

(1970), atavistically denounces women's sensuality. However, most modern male writers, seemingly caught in an iron dialectic, now blame women for being insufficiently sexual, for having deserted nature and the flesh. Men cry out that such a betrayal has left them naked before an ominous technology, a mechanical age advancing as coldly, as surely, as the ancient glaciers themselves. They forget that women have had very little to do with inventing that technology.

Scapegoating is often irresistible. Most reasonable people will agree that it is morally irresponsible and emotionally primitive. It too easily permits us to shuck off the load of our own inadequacies and guilt. To be a woman, and to think about women as scapegoats, is provoking. It stimulates outrage, as unjustly being made a victim, and tedium, at having once again to trance a pattern of victimization. Seeing women as scapegoats is a critical method which I hope will organize some of the literature of the past, but which we must all hope will disappear from the literature of the future.

---

(1) Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, abridged ed. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Book, 1958), makes suggestive, but scattered, comments about women as scapegoats and anti-feminism as a prejudice.

(2) Chapter 16, Verse 10, King James Version. The New English Bible (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), does not use the word. Instead it says:

> He (Aaron) shall cast lots over the two goats, one to be for the LORD and the other for the Precipice. He shall present the goat on which the lot for the LORD has fallen and deal with it as a sin-offering; but the goat on which the lot for the Precipice has fallen shall be made to stand alive before the LORD, for expiation to be made over it before it is driven away into the wilderness to the Precipice.

The New English Bible seems to correct a false, if deeply rooted, derivation from the Hebrew. Tyndale's erroneous use of the notion of a departing goat can be traced back to Luther, to Jerome, and others. For more detail, see Ernest Klein, A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of The English Language, Vol. II (Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing Co., 1967), p. 1392.

(3) For Frazer's full discussion, see The Golden Bough (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., St. Martin's Library, 1957), abridged edition, Vol. II, pp. 706-768.

(4) Maggie: A Girl of the Streets, intro. by Van Wyck Brooks (Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Premier Book), pp. 73-74.

(5) Code of the West (New York: Pocket Books, 1970), pp. 73-74.

(6) Ibid., p. 220.

(7) The Subjection of Women, Essays on Sex Equality, ed. Alice S. Rossi, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 136.

(8) "Femininity," New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis, trans. and ed. by James Strachey (New York: W. W. Norton, 1965), p. 116. Italics mine.

(9) Female Sexuality (New York: Grove Press, Evergreen Black Cat Book, reprinted from 1953 edition), p. 83.

(10) In The Complete Novels and Selected Tales of Nathanial Hawthorne, ed. Norman Holmes Pearson (New York: Modern Library, 1937), p. 89.

(11) Ibid., p. 114.

(12) Studies (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1955), pp. 102-103.

(13) Ibid., pp. 104-105.

(14) In Second Sex, trans. and ed. H. M. Parshley (New York: Bantam Books edition, 1968), pp. xi-xxix, 129-185.

TEACHING WOMEN'S STUDIES: AN EXPERIMENT AT STOUT STATE

Sheila Tobias and Ella Kusnetz

All over the United States today courses about women are being offered in the universities. Most of them are no more than one or two years old, and by all accounts they are imaginative and well-attended, with students and faculty inspired by the possibilities of a new and timely field. In some universities full academic programs on women have already been funded and there have been at least six regional conferences on women's studies in the past eighteen months.

Most women's studies courses are offered in departments of liberal arts, by humanists, sociologists, psychologists, and historians. Although many of the subjects covered have traditionally come under the home economics rubrick (early childhood development, sex-role socialization, family sociology, opportunities of the female labor force), with few exceptions, departments and schools of home economics have not yet participated in this renaissance of interest in the study of women. One exception to this was at Cornell where we had taught "The Evolution of Female Personality" in 1970 in the College of Home Economics. Thus, we were anxious to see whether there would be potential for a mutually instructive relationship between the two fields on a national level.

Hence, when Tony Samenfink, dean of Home Economics at Stout State University in Menomonie, Wisconsin, asked us to teach a two-week version of the Cornell course to his summer session students last June, we were interested in the idea. His purpose and ours in accepting the assignment, was to ascertain whether there might be a permanent place for women's studies in the regular home economics curriculum.

We agreed to call the course "The Social Roles of Women in America," but to treat these roles analytically rather than descriptively. That is, we would consider not simply what societal roles women traditionally fill, but specifically what cultural assumptions account for their secondary occupational status and their noticeable absence from national leadership. We would then go beyond an examination of these adult roles to look at the socialization process: how the self-esteem of girl children is lowered as they learn that sex-role differentiation is inevitable and that men and women naturally behave in opposing and mutually exclusive ways. Finally, we would move beyond analysis to feminist criticism: our personal belief that prevailing cultural assumptions are particularly damaging to the female and frustrating to normal human needs for an expressive life. It was a large order we set ourselves, but we felt on firm theoretical ground. Both pedagogically and intellectually, we see women's studies in terms of a frank critique of the culture.

We had come to this kind of critical approach to the study of women through the gradual development of our own thinking, a process influenced by a new feminist movement that was only coming of age ideologically during and after that first course at Cornell. At first we had believed that when

we talk about women as a group we were talking about social problems: problems women have and problems women create. Betty Friedan and Caroline Bird were our original mentors. Friedan described, in The Feminine Mystique, a "problem without a name," the malaise and unhappiness of women in suburban ghettos; and Bird in Born Female documented a public problem, economic and legal discrimination against women in America.

These were pioneering works and they are still invaluable, but as analysis they were only a beginning. For to consider women as a "problem" is to accept unthoughtfully certain cherished but at best dubious American myths: the open society, reward through individual initiative, the ideal of equality, the eagerness of society to reform if only people of good will would point the way.

Kate Millett's "theory of patriarchy" was by no means original with her, but when Sexual Politics was published in the summer of 1970, the implications of her thesis struck everyone with devastating clarity. We began to suspect that the "woman problem" is no problem and no accident; indeed that the exclusion of women from national prominence is an essential, institutionalized feature of American society. At that point, the women's liberation movement began to go on the offensive and to describe, interestingly enough, the "male problem" in America: the exaggerated "masculine mystique" of the Hemingway/ Mailer cult and the culture's apparent need to keep women down.

II

Stout State University is a branch of the University of Wisconsin that specializes in vocational training in the industrial arts for boys, and in home economics for girls. The summer course was unfortunately advertised nondescriptively as "Topics in Family Life." The class, therefore, was smaller than anticipated (seven young women and one male auditor) and also, the students were randomly selected rather than self-selected by interest in feminism. The Dean of Home Economics and the Chairman of the Department of Child Development, Dr. Beverly Schmalzried, were certain that the course would have been much larger had its perspective been known. But as it turned out the poor publicity was a felicitous mistake, for the class was just the kind of randomly selected group of home economics students that made the experience a useful experiment.

From the beginning it was clear that the students like the course (although at first they were a bit awed by not one but two visiting feminists from the east.) We met four hours a day for two weeks, and even in this short, intense period they were able to deal successfully with broadly varied subject matter, in as many as six different disciplines. Our own fields are history and literature, respectively, and the class came to enjoy this, to say the least, broad interpretation of "family studies". We worked, in fact, from readings in sociology, literature, economics, law, history and psychology. We assigned individual and group projects (a content analysis of a family television show, a survey of women workers in a local factory) and had them write for us in a "journal" a continuing essay that was to be personal and thoughtful, integrating class discussion with the readings and documenting their developing "consciousness."

We brought with us a substantial library of new works on women, including several unpublished papers written by academic feminists, and a package of material printed by KNOW, Inc., a garage press in Pittsburgh. The students had never heard of most of the books; in fact, they were unaware that courses on women like this one were being offered anywhere. At the same time, they were impressive for their immediate grasp on the material and quick understanding of what was being asked of them.

III

The Image of Women

We began the course with an unpublished paper on the "Image of Women in Fairy Tales" by Marcia Liebermann, a professor of English at the University of Connecticut, and a not very widely distributed article called "Children's Literature and Sex-Role Stereotypes" by Elizabeth Fisher. Then we turned to "One off the Short List," a short story by Doris Lessing (for its astute portrayal of adult sex role playing rather than specifically for its literary content) and also several chapters in The Feminine Mystique which studied the content of women's magazines during the post-war era. Our subject: the images of women in literature and the media, from childhood to adulthood. As the students quickly perceived, these images are remarkably consistent as they are presented to all populations; women embody passivity, powerlessness, secondary status. In fairy tales the figure of the "princess" is supposed to demonstrate to little girls all the good female virtues. Translated, virtue seems to mean beauty, for unless she is beautiful the princess is unloved and doesn't marry. She is neither petted, nor pitied nor "saved" from her dreadful fate. Even the stories of beautiful princesses have a message of resignation for little girls; they stop at marriage, for if "ever after . . ." is happy it is not interesting enough to write about even in fantasies. Indeed, except for the witches, women in fairy tales are weak and passive to the point of disappearance, but what little girl would be shrewd enough to root for the fearful witch?

Perhaps fairy tales reflect some myth of the race's primal past, some shizophrenic split in the perception of women as either fearful or benign. But modern children's literature, even when pretending to describe contemporary reality, promotes the same message. Boys are adventurers, explorers, doers affecting the world; girls are docile and pleasing and they are preeminently the watchers of all this activity. Adult women are portrayed as happy and homebound; adult men go to work and run the world. Male and female roles are portrayed not just as different, they are opposite, and the status of girls and women is always inferior.

Friedan's book illustrates the advertisers' view of adult women: vain, gullible, incompetent, in short, easy prey. As an exercise one evening, we had the students watch one installment of a so-called "family comedy" on television, "All in the Family." By chance, the plot had to do with the mother's selection for jury duty and the family's serious doubts as to her competence. Our students began to be persuaded that the visual like the print media put women down. The cultural message is consistent.

The discussion of the image of women led naturally to other questions. What do we know about the biology of secondary sex differences? Is it nature or nurture? How is sex-differentiated behavior learned? What are the effects of sex-typing of activities and sex-typing of personality on ourselves? We could not arrive at conclusive answers, but for the first time the students found themselves thinking about the origins of their own peculiarly male or female behavior patterns. They remembered that as children deviation from prescribed behavior was punished, and wondered why it was always more ignominious for a boy to be a "sissy" than for a girl to be a tom-boy. (Could it be that parents are horrified at a male child's imitation of the more socially undesirable role? Or that fears of male homosexuality are stronger than fears of lesbianism because the former provides too serious a challenge to the masculine mystique?)

We imaginatively projected childhood roles on up through adulthood, observing that the secretary-as-office-wife is an acceptable occupation for a woman, but that the female boss is considered an abberation. We considered, finally, the probable personnel needs of a post-industrial society, and wondered whether in the future these exaggerated sex-roles will be useful to the society, or indeed, to <u>either</u> sex.

<u>Psychology of Sex Differences</u>

Our discussion of the images of women led us to survey the ways in which the behavioral sciences have dealt with sex differences and sex-roles. Relying heavily on Kate Millett's <u>Sexual Politics</u>, we challenged the Freudian notions about womens' psyches and the traditional family sociologists' view of women's roles. Like Millett, we decided to look upon the classical views of women as historical phenomena, reflecting specific time-bound cultural patterns rather than any timeless truths.

But having laid aside these theories, we found ourselves in new and relatively uncharted territory. We were looking for a psychology of women that was not biased by notions of "penis envy" as in Freud or "natural mother instinct" as in so many family sociologists. There were a few old standbys we could call upon: Simone de Beauvoir's <u>The Second Sex</u> and Eleanor Maccoby's <u>The Development of Sex Differences</u>. But de Beauvoir's analysis of female behavior, though it rings remarkably true for every female reader, is not systematic, nor is it based on experimental evidence; and the Maccoby book, while presenting honestly all sorts of contradictory research about the bio-cultural network that causes behavior, disappoints the student who is looking for definite answers.

Our students were especially interested in the research on intellectual differences in young males and females. One researcher concludes that the most creative children are those who have experienced both male and female socialization. This possibility very much excited our students, as did Matina Horner's fairly new and provocative study of "fear of success" among women

college students that our students read in summary form. But these constitute only a start of the work in reconstructing theories of feminine psychology that is needed.

V

Law, Economics and Politics

The transition to a discussion of the status and experience of working women in America may have seemed abrupt to our students, but we tried to make the connections for them. Insofar as the American woman works to support her family she is not deviating from expected role behavior, but insofar as she seeks achievement in her work or defines herself primarily as a professional, she does deviate and is "punished" on the job and among her peers.

The effects of this bind on women in the work force are several, and women experience both active discrimination and also more subtle and insidious barriers to advancement: lower pay for similar work; pervasive myths about greater female absenteeism and unstable turnover of jobs; reluctance to assume authority (because it goes against a woman's notion of her proper role) and especial difficulty in exercising authority over men, because men are so threatened by role reversal.

The class could not decide whether the active or the passive discrimination was more significant; whether women are discriminated against because, as women's liberation argues, men are "sexist," unwilling and unable to treat women as occupationally equal or, because under social pressure women themselves sublimate ambition. We did read descriptions of work by angry working women in Sisterhood is Powerful (a collection of articles from Women's Liberation), which blame the men, and also some articles in The Better Half which blame the "system." We could only conclude, having done this brief analysis, that under present circumstances, whatever the complex of causes, women pay a heavy psychological toll for competing with men.

A socio-economic study of women in the 1890's compared to the present showed us that while the earlier workers were primarily black, immigrant, widowed, single, or very young, the working woman today is typically married and a mother, 39 years old and likely to work another 25 years. One can speculate about the anxiety felt by working mothers in a culture that prescribes staying home or the frustration of a woman who is not supposed to be ambitious but who sees her years of health and desire to work stretching out into the future. Alternately, we thought about the non-working woman and discussed the necessity of outside employment for the development of an individual's self-esteem. The class found some significance in the fact that goods and services produced in and for the home (usually by women) are not deemed worthy of inclusion in the Gross National Product.

Discussion of economic discrimination led to consideration of legal discrimination against women. The class was surprised to learn that the 14th

amendment (which denied the restriction of civil rights to all men) has been interpreted by the courts to deny personhood to women. We discussed those remaining state laws which still classify women as a form of property or a child-like minors; also the so-called "protective" labor legislation such as weight-lifting restrictions which are often used to ensure against women becoming foremen. We did point out that some recent legislation passed since the early sixties has been the basis of some successful suits brought on behalf of women workers. These Executive Orders and laws include the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the Executive Orders which forbid sex discrimination in those institutions (including universities) which receive federal contracts.

VI

History, Literature, and "The Movement"

When we turned to the history of women we concentrated on the suffrage movement both because the subject is left out of most American history courses and textbooks and also because it offers models of women in an earlier era who challenged sex-role stereotypes. But we looked also at anti-feminist assumptions prevalent in the early 19th century, and read an unpublished paper by Dr. Carol Rosenberg at the University of Pennsylvania on "The Female Animal: Medical Views of Women in 19th Century America." At first the students balked at being taught history in a social science course. But we made explicit a point only implied in earlier classes: that traditional ideas seems less inevitable when treated historically. If notions such as "functional roles" or "penis envy", or the "feminine mystique" have had discernable beginnings, then one might speculate that these assumptions might one day be discredited.

Similarly, when we came to women's liberation, we speculated as to why the movement began when and where it did, among dissatisfied radical women students and "over-educated" housewives. Our reading in women's liberation material concentrated mostly on critiques of marrage and family life. From the previous discussion of female employment in America, students were already interested in the progress of a national day-care system, and we went on to discuss radical alternatives to current life styles, reading in some detail about the Israeli Kibbutz and Soviet experiments with collective child-rearing.

Of the articles written by women in the movement, one short piece on becoming "old" at 43 had an unexpectedly marked effect on the female students who, despite their youth, are already cognizant of the particular penalties growing old brings to women in our society. Another article by a radical lesbian who claimed that liberation of women can only take place in the complete absence of men, led the students to a discussion of sex, personal priorities, and more specifically than heretofore, their reactions to the course. (One delightfully honest girl said, "I'm sorry, my sympathies stop here.")

We introduced a discussion of literature toward the end of the course to show that it is not only in "low culture" (folk tales, magazine fiction, television, etc.) that women tend to have stereotypic social identities, but also in "high culture," that is most literature written by males. Our

examples ranged (a bit wildly) over modern American and English fiction -- Hawthorne, Hardy, Henry James, Hemingway, D. H. Lawrence, Mailer -- but the students understood our point: in the work of male writers one can see the female characters falling into certain archetypal configurations. The "Angel" is the idealized female, passive, feminine, tied to the home and making men less brutish by her inspiration. The strong woman is a "castrating bitch" and she provokes in males the egoistic need to conquer her sexually. The "earth mother" is all natural, all sexual, and while the male characters appear to worship her they are more likely worshiping the effects of their own imagined sexual prowess.

But if male writers tend to see women in stereotypes, women, not always but more frequently, write about women as human beings. The class read, with apparent enjoyment although they did not consider themselves literary, some poetry by Anne Sexton and Denise Levertov, and some short stories by Doris Lessing. We discussed what it means for modern women writers to be finally asserting their own identities after centuries of pseudonyms and hidden manuscripts -- to be finding material in their own experience and writing consciously and defiantly personal literature.

VII

Conclusion

The fundamental issue is probably not whether the course at Stout State was popular or well-done. It is whether we can mix a critique of "sexual politics" with the standard home economics curriculum. This question in turn involves the very notion of the identity of home economics within the context of university education for young adults.

Historically, schools of home economics educated professionals who brought the benefits of science and technology to bear upon that part of the rural economy which was home-based, and, by tradition, under the care of women. That the bulk of these professionals, like the overwhelming majority of their clients, were female, reflected the division of labor by sex on the farm. But just as food production became "agri-business" and male students in state-supported colleges of agriculture moved into large corporations, home economics also became professional, providing technicians for the clothing, food and hotel industries as well as extension-agents for the home-maker.

Today, as that part of the economy dealing in services begins to outstrip that part dealing in production of goods, the service professions (among them those that have been until now considered "female") are going to increase in status, pay and attractiveness. Since men have first choice of professions, some of the traditionally female jobs will become male-dominated in their higher and middle ranks. Library work has already shown these tendencies as, with the introduction of mechanized data retrieval, it has become a higher status profession than it was before and no longer offers vertical mobility to women. Thus, we can look to having more men in leadership positions in previously female professions, including home economics.

Over the years, colleges of home economics have also educated non-professionals: in particular, future housewives who did not expect to go to work. There was from the beginning, then a dual commitment: to domestic science

and to women. This second commitment accounts for the gradual introduction of consumer economics and child development into the curriculum, as consumption became more central to housewifely duties than food-production and clothing construction. The question is how strong is this second commitment? As men move into the home economics professions, will the colleges of home economics cease to educate women altogether? At Cornell and elsewhere the colleges have already changed their names and their priorities to "human ecology" or "human environments" in order better to attract men students and teachers. Or, will home economics institutions be left educating only women? At some schools, the most viable departments are being combined with related subjects outside home economics.

These dilemmas are not unknown to deans and college presidents. Their decisions about the future of home economics may well be determined in part by the amount of vigor and undergraduate interest shown in the field in the next few years. One good case for women's studies can be made on the grounds that feminist courses attract strong student constituencies. The Cornell college benefited directly and financially from the fact that large numbers of arts and science students crossed the campus to study women. An even stronger case, in our view, can be made that through women's studies, home economics can move into areas that represent very pressing national needs: institutional child care, support for welfare families, contraception and abortion legislation, architectural innovations to provide for more efficient, more androgynous and, possibly, more communal living arrangements.

In the next few years federal, state and local governments will be looking for programmatic recommendations that will meet the needs of the poor and of women. If colleges of home economics are not working on these issues, they may not receive the students or funding they have enjoyed in the past.

THE SYLLABUS

Following is a list of the required readings by subject-day. Articles marked with * are available in a pre-selected package of material sold by KNOW, Inc., 726 St. James Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15232. Write for the entire list. Articles marked ** are available from Sheila Tobias, Provost's Office, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut 06457 for $.75 each (including postage).

The Social Roles of Women in America, Stout State University

Day 1. Doris Lessing, "One Off the Short List" (out of print)**
Lionel Tiger "The Biological Origins of Sexual Discrimination" in The Other Half, ed. Goode and Epstein, (Spectrum 1971).

William J. Goode "Civil and Social Rights of Women: in The Other Half, op. cit.

Day 2. Marcia Lieberman "Female Acculturation Through Fairy Tales," unpublished essay**
Elizabeth Fisher, "The Image of Women in Children's Literature"*
"The Happy Housewife Syndrome", chapter 2 in Betty Friedan's Feminine Mystique, (Doubleday, 1964).

Day 3. "The Sexual Solipsism in Sigmund Freud," in Friedan's, Feminine Mystique, op. cit.

Naomi Weisstein, "Psychology Reconstructs the Female,"*
Matina Horner, "Women's Will to Avoid Success"*
Evening assignment: To watch "All in the Family" a TV show

Day 4. "The Employed Woman in America" Marny White**
"Women in the Professions" and "The Secretarial Proletariat" in, Robin Morgan, Ed. Sisterhood is Powerful, (Random House, 1970)

"Equal Rights Amendment Testimony" M. Rawalt*
B. Sandler on the law and women*

"Does the Law Oppress Women?" Diane Schulder in Sisterhood is Powerful, op. cit.

Day 5. "The Female Animal: Medical Views of 19th Century Women," by Carol Rosenberg, Ph.D.**

Day 7. "Women in American History" Ch. 4. in Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique, op. cit.

"Historical Perspectives" in Sisterhood is Powerful, op. cit.

"Notes of a Radical Lesbian" in Sisterhood is Powerful, op. cit.

Day 8. Collection of Poems by women writers.**

Poetry as Protest in Sisterhood is Powerful, op. cit.

"Sexual Politics" by Kate Millett in The Other Half, op. cit.

Day 9. "Up from Sexism" section of Sisterhood is Powerful, op. cit.

Selections from KNOW package*
Section 6 in The Other Half, op. cit.
Zoe Moss "The Ageing Process" in Sisterhood is Powerful, op. cit.

Day 10. "Elements and Types in Soviet Marriage" by Kent Geiger in The Other Half, op. cit.

Further recommended bibliography obtainable from Sheila Tobias, or (for $.50) from Lucinda Cisler 102 W. 80th Street New York 10024.

Other course syllabi available from KNOW Inc.

FEMINIST STUDIES: FRILL OR NECESSITY?

Marilyn Salzman-Webb

I. Why Feminist Studies Anyway?

When I think about Feminist Studies I think more about "Feminist" than I do about "Studies." Although this may be a false way of saying it, I think Feminist Studies Programs should be more closely tuned to an on-going feminist movement than to the university proper. What has come to be considered the operating assumptions of American universities seems greatly divergent from the aims of a feminist movement, although this means more of a necessity for consciousness of our own situation than for splitting with established universities right now.

Each of us has her own theory of what feminism is, but somehow we hope they all can mesh. In mine I assume that the prime goal of a feminist revolution is the elimination of patriarchal rule. Although other sisters have already written books on the subject, I consider partiarchy the first class division between people, giving one group by birth-right, the authority to rule over another. Historically, once this authority was acknowledged, the groundwork was laid for groups to split into further refined rulers and ruled. So we saw the development of a slave class, then serfs, then an industrial working class, and more currently, colonized nations. We have alternately called this same power dynamic racism, sexism and imperialism, but what is basic to all is the right of hierarchal rule. This is the basic challenge of a feminist movement.

In formulating this challenge we need to do two things: 1) learn about our dondition and recapture an identity out of our colonized state, and 2) avoid heirarchal distinctions between us as an example of a new society we plan to create. Some call this last part the development of femal collectivity. I would agree, but stress that implicit in collective action is the development of each individual's strengths and potential, and this is where feminist studies fits in.

As part of a feminist movement, the goals of a Feminist Studies program should be for each women to learn as deeply and as broadly as possible the historical, literary, biclogical and psychological roots of our collective colonization and to formulate theoretical perspectives of what female nature is and could be. Implicit in intellectual learning, should be the development of a process of collective thought, study and action: form and content. One of these goals is no more important than the other.

Now this is precisely the antithesis of what universities are all about. Rather than building collectivity, they divide by competitiveness and grade hierarchies. Rather than creating group solidarity, they create an intellectual elite whose social status, but not power, is

meant to be above those who have never received a higher education. This is not done by accident or through faulty educational theory, but to serve a society that demands a highly technical yet compliant working class.

If we are not careful, rather than making any dent in a patriarchal class system, we will instead create careers in academic studies on women and have noe relationship with the great majority of women to whom we will become like overseers. So divided, we will all fail to change so pervasive a power dynamic.

So we need to clarify two things! What is it we teach and how. I think the two are not separable. What I hope to "teach" my students is that they can develop a solid core of themselves, they can learn their past history in connection with women of all times, and that they can work and learn better together than they can apart.

But I have reached the end of my thought process too quickly. Let me go back. I was trained at a very scholarly institution. When we learned history, we learned only from authorities who had done the finest research and who lectured on their findings. When they spoke of other times and cultures, they traced intricate threads through the causes of national or international conflicts that led to wars. The more enlightened told of changes that industrialism wrought in moving populations from rural areas to cities.

Their stories were always those of the most powerful in a society; the rationalizations the powerful used to stay in power, or when the hands of power changed (say from land rich to merchant wealth), the reasons for the decline of one class and the rise of another. Their stories left huge gaps? Why was it that there were classes anyway? What were those not in the ruling classes doing? If there were struggles what were they about?

Since women have never been in power, of course it is never the history of women we learn. We rarely know how a woman's day was spent in 1600. We have little idea how industrialism profoundly changed her relationship with the world or with her husband and kids. We don't know how her life changed at the movement of industry away from her home. We have no histories of the development of the "modern" nuclear family through the eyes of women who lived through these changes. And thus we have no view of how those not in the ruling classes -- the common people --say their own struggles for survival.

Furthermore, the way whatever information we were given was presented (i.e. lectures by only the most knowledgeable experts), reinforced in form what was being taught in content. We learned that there has always been a system of authority in the world, and that those at the top must remain unchallenged, while those at the bottom must consider themselves insignificant at the feet of those enlightened few.

Now most of us know all this, since we have all been educated this way. But often we are not alert to the ways in which we incorporate

this manner of thinking into the changes we are trying to make ourselves. When we teach about sexual politics, it's a class heirarchy we are attacking. If we recreate this class division within our teaching, our analysis is devoid of form. That's why as feminist teachers, it's just as important for us to look at how we teach as to look at what we teach.

As an example of how our own intellectual mutilation continues to shape our studies in old ways, let's look at one sister's work. Yesterday I visited the class of a very knowledgeable colleague in another college. She taught a class on women's labor history. She had done extensive research but when she presented this information, she was unapproachable. She fielded questions expertly, after she finished a two hour lecture, and in the process insulted people's intelligence for not having done the research she had, for wasting her time with meaningless questions, etc. When pressed to understand what her presentation mught mean for our movement, she refused comment. This is scholarly research about women, but it is done in the aristocratic tradition of a class society, one of whole ceremonies involves humiliating those in a lower class. This is not what one would hope would be the uses of knowledge in a Feminist Studies Program, yet we all tend, most likely, to fall into that trap.

Or consider another trap, the one of objectivity. Another colleague at a different college from mine teaches a course on Greek mythology. Hoping to be very objective in her presentation, she only had people read the myths, all of which are extremely patriarchal. She hoped, without saying so, that students would see how patriarchy was the basis of all the myths, but her course failed because it was hardly noticed because it was no different than modern America. Because she failed to clarify her own biases against patriarchy, the sheer weight of its all-pervasiveness left it unquestioned. All she was left with was the highly intellectual debate we are all familiar with in school settings. Her students had some understanding of women's condition classicly, but saw no basis for it's cause and had no passion for change in any particular direction.

This is the classic trap of all intellectuals; that there should never be any analysis taught, although implicity, what ends up being taught is a basic acceptance of what is and an understanding of why it is. Again, this is not what we would hope would come out of a Feminist Studies program. Not that we want to produce blinded advocates of any particular line, but we should at least consider that the reason we are learning at all is to act on the world, and that the direction of our action as feminists should be toward getting to the root of the problem and eliminating it.

II. Feminism as a Philosophy of Knowledge

We come from a different place than most "departments" or "programs" within universities. We have an analysis and a direction in which we feel change should occur. By university definitions, we are hardly "objective" (read: willing to take what is as immutable). But we shouldn't crumble before this charge, because we are doing profound and scholarly thingking in areas never touched by most university scholars, only we have a context in which to fit our research. It is the fact of

having this context that makes what we are doing so vital.

Feminism is a philosophy of knowledge. It is the intellectual understanding of the historical struggle between domination and submission; between what Kate Millet calls that group of people born to rule and that born to be ruled. Questions such as: "What is the psychological dynamic that accepts submission?" "What are the forms of passive and active resistence used to combat a colonized state?" "What are the basic units of social organization that develop systems of authoritarianism?", are as current today as they were in prehistory.

As a philosphy of knowledge, feminism is concerned with the forms and functions of power and how it has been weilded. Such a philosophy cuts across so-called "disciplines" to include psychology (both of the individual and in groups; the colonizer and the colonized); sociology (social forms of power and class development); economics (uses of power with varied economic bases in history); biology (is there such a thing as biological inferiority?); and of course the study of history, literature and the arts. But this study is from a wholly different context: it is the history of what was created both by the dominated and the dominator to sustain or struggle against that domination.

Feminism is also a dialectical understanding, in the Marxist sense of dialectic. Among any colonized group a dynamic develops between those aspects of their situation produced by the colonized state and those aspects inherent in their collective identity. and produced out of struggle against colonization. In black history we have some good examples because scholars have been focusing longer on this dialectic. For example, much of what we call slave culture was created in response to captivity (eg. Uncle Tomism as a survival tactic; which Bruno Bettelheim has demonstrated also occurred in German concentration camps). But a large portion of so-called slave culture is actually part of a religious and social heritage created in Africa and developed for resistence purposes. This is part of alarger black-African identity that has been successfully hidden from whit observers for centuries, mainly through secret societies throughout the Americas.

Likewise, we have no sense yet what part of feminist cultural identity is created by captivity, and what part is indeed created out of some notion of female principle strengthen by collective resistence. (Empathy, for example, as a female trait). We really don't know what the true nature of the female experience is outside of the colonized situation, and this can never be known until patriarchy ends, but, what we can attempt to understand is what body of knowledge has been created out of the female experience, and leave it to later scholars to sort out.

I keep having to leave this work to do other things. For instance, it is hard for me to sit and write for long periods of time. I notice dust on the floor and have to get out the vacuum cleaner and clean it up because it makes me nervous to work if the room isn't clean. My desk is a wreck since my little girl likes to scribble on my equally important notes to myself. She comes home from nursery school in a little while, so half my mind is on whether her father or I will pick her up today, and so

on. Now I can hardly imagine what my writing would be like were these things not on my mind. If I had a house slave, as most male writers do, to do all these small services, I might be able to pay attention to more lofty thoughts, and so my work would be totally different, probably more rarified. But is that a work of true human nature, or just the work of one group of humans who manages to so stiltify thought by having a slave class that they are out of touch with the nitty gritty of life in their works. Who is to say that work is more valid?

In our cultural history research, art and literature that is called great stems from a tridition that rests on a slave class. Look at any book on your bookshelf. Most say, "And last but not least, I am grateful to my wife who protected me from any intrusions and suffered alone with the incantations of this budding author." Now we all know what that means! he stayed locked in his study thinking, while she took care of the kids, made him meals, shopped, kept his house and study cleaned, took abuse from him when he felt unable to work, and perhaps even did all his transcribing, typing and editing, as well as mailed his manuscripts and corresponded with publishers. Terrific of him to thank her! But this is just the surface. How can such a situation not effect the work he produces? He rarely ever experiences life, or if he does, he knows only a narrow portion of it. So his reality is blinded by his position.

Now were his wife to get some time to herself to write we might see a totally different version of what life is, of what the universe is, of her thoughts in relation to other life forms, etc. Or she might not think about that at all. In any case, her writing, both in form (since she presumably would only have a few minutes to scratch something out here and there) and content, would be in another dimension. Now supposing both of them were equally in touch with the nitty gritty of life as well as with the philosophy of it. We have no idea what would come out of either of their works, since there are hardly any societies as examples. Kenneth Pichford, husband of feminist Robin Morgan, writes of this in his poetry. He has found that his poems, one long, now can only be written on one page--that is all the time he has for concentration, and their young son would rip up what he laid down as quickly as he could type a second page. I remember a line in one of his poems on this subject: (and this is only paraphrased) "How can these men clain to speak of life when they have never, not even once, been in touch with shit in a Pamper/" Ah men!

III. <u>What Do We Teach</u>?

But this still leaves unanswered the question of what it is we reach. When I think about my own education I can hardly remember a single fact I learned, although I have many blue books still at hand to affirm that I did indeed know some, and even got high grades on them. They have slipped away, along with my images of the lofty professors who told me them. But I have more vivid memories of the less lofty professors who bothered to show me how they were going about learning whatever they were doing; These were the ones who taught me just a little about how to think and about the importance of having a reason for learning anything, a framework to fit whatever it is I wanted to

learn into. Usually the framework that helped me learn most coherently was one that I was trying to act on. For instance, when I was working in a community school some years back, I read everything I could about welfare, educational theories and philosophies, poverty, inner city sociology and so on. I was trying to do something, and all I needed was someone to tell me where to look to learn.

Most universities are not structures with this premise in mind. Instead the working premise seems to be that it is good (for inner peace of something) to know certain bodies of knowledge. Therefore they promptly forget, sometimes even before the ink dries on their B.A.s. Or maybe they are not so sterile as that. Maybe in fact what university students learn is how to develop the self-confidence and chutzpa to bluff through what they don't know, i.e. to put on a good show. For it is this very skill which allows them to function as a class above those who have not been to college.

But as feminists it is not this skill, or the sterile body of information we are trying to teach. Or at least I don't believe we should be. Instead, we should be attempting to develop each women's abilities to sort out a situation, to develop a solid core of herself enough to determine a direction that she can take seriously, and to learn how to find whatever information she needs to do what she has set her mind on doing.

This is not to say that our entire program is all therapy and no information. Just the opposite. Therapy often allows people to cope with what they shouldn't put up with. Instead what we teach should be chock full of information, but information that's useful to personal growth. The only caution I feel is that if a teacher is not always conscious of both aspects of her teaching, she will lapse back into the styles of our own training and forget the purpose of a feminist education.

And this is so very vague, what did I mean, you ask. Well I think all that we teach should have intrinsic to it and understanding of the power dynamic of patriarchy, and a purpose that is constantly up front about action against this dynamic. I mean it's more how we look at whatever body of information we have. Say we are studying history. We read many letters and diaries of women who have lived in different times and places before us. What do we wnat to know from this history? We want to ask what their objective situation was, what were the cultural myths that bound them there, what intersections were there between them as individuals and the historical events and conditions surrounding their lives, how might they have changed their situation (i.e. what were the dimensions they could have moved in and why didn't they?) We don't want to stop here.

To answer any of these questions a student would have to look more in depth at a time period of the life of one woman than just her own writings. She would have to learn the historian's craft of how to do research: what laws were passed to see what many women were doing that threatened male authorities, what did other observers thind of the same historical moment, from what position were they speaking, what were the physical boundaries of life at that time, etc.

To make any of this research mean something to our struggle tody, intrinsic to this course should be personal autobiography or written statement about the student's own life. What are the intersections of the individual and the historical moment there, what are the mythologies that blind us, what are the boundaries of action. Asking these questions of history moves us further along in our struggle, gives us depth to look at our own condition, and gives us more of an idea how sisters long dead dealt with similar questions. History becomes a breathing body of our collective consciousness, and not a work of fact to be buried between the covers of some journal.

This is to say I don't particularly feel any body of knowledge is more or less relevant to feminist curriculia, but it is how we look at that knowledge, what questions we ask of it, and how it is useful for an understanding of our own struggle that makes it relevant or not.

Which leads me again to the question of objectivity in teaching. A lot of times colleagues will criticize us for not upholding the scientific doctrine of objectivity. I think there is no such thing as objectivity. There is only honest admission of biases and dishonesty (or ignorance, not to impute motives of malice). Let's look again, not at the friend who teaches Green mythology but anotherwho teaches economics. Most economist teaching in the U.S. teach only the intricasies of Capitalist economics. My friend maintains that this is useful for the student trying to function in the real world and if her were to do otherwise he would be teaching philosophy at best, but ideiolgy most likely. His assumption of the continued existence of this economic system never is mentioned. And so we have trained economists who only can function within a certain context and not think outside of it or even see what it's assumptions for how human beings lives are. The same with law, medicine and most other disciplines.

Objectivity assumes that it is fair to represent all sides, but we know that all sides are never given equal weight. Without an understanding of what basic assumptions someone makes in teaching, students may not be aware that some sides are excluded before the discussion even begins. (eg. does an objective history of the settling of America ever question the right of settlers to import the notions of private property or nuclear family?) Rather than teaching any falacious objective approach, feminist teaching does and should have apoint of view. We as teachers must be up front about our assumptions, not that we become preaching ideologues, but that we make clear our rejection of a system that insists on scientism as a way of obscuring that there may be numerous explanations or descriptions of any occurrance, but any explanation is based on where that observer is coming from.

IV. <u>How Do We Teach</u>?

Classicly the purpose of public education in the U.S. was to create a more sophistocated manner of rule by intellectual and psychological indoctrination. To this purpose today has been added the need for a technically knowledgeable working class. Until recently education for the elite was very different. It has included knowledge of their own

traditional roots (Greek and Roman antiquity as historical examples of refined upper class rule). Today education continues this historical tradition and channels people in a class society. Because of this it has always been conducted in the style of hierarchical rule ("Teach the kids respect," they've called it.)

But what we're trying to do should be for different purposes. We are not trying to internalize the need for authority hierarchies. Nor are we terribly respectful of traditions based on slave classes or imperialist ventures as in ancient Greece or Rome. Nor, I believe, are we the least concerned with the creation of a technical troups of workers to make for the smooth running of a war wociety. Feminism, instead is based on the elimination of all domination/submission relationships, and these are inherent in a class based society. Therefore we must look carefully both at how we teach as intrinsic to what we teach.

It is true that some people have more skill or knowledge than others. They have this not by having birth right, but because they have spent some time acquiring it. Those who become students wnat to learn this knowledge of skill, so the main question for every feminist teacher is how to teach without imposing authoritarian structures. Coupled with this is the need for building a consciousness of an alternative, eg. collective learning and action. So how to teach what one has learned to those who have not but want to is endeed worthy or some attention. In addition, most students coming through our public school systems have already developed a set of responses to those called teachers, so acting differently in one's role as teacher is not easy.

First off, students taking feminist courses in college are not apt to see this as you do. For the teacher feminism is a way of viewing everything else one is learning, doing, seeing. It is a philosophy, a politic and a life view..an analysis of the world. For the student it may be that, but it is usually just another course, on a equal bar with pottery, dance technique and French. Furthermore, a feminism is quickly becoming a fad, so even the noraml class expectation of seriousness may not apply. So the teacher is faced with a double job: helping people to understand the seriousness of a feminist philosophy and teaching so that students feel a strength of collective learning rather than hierarchal control.

Since it is the strength of each student we hope to build, how best can we do this? Most women have had neither experience in the world nor real reinforcement and support in doing a thing well. Any skill women have is usually taken as a hobby. So what is the role of the teacher? Because there are set responses to things called schools, feminist classes should try to be as different as possible from such settings. They must try to include actual experiences of what we are talking about in our teaching so real conclusions can be made (not unthought out acceptance of ideas.)

Here are some examples. Many schools now include in classes on mental illness days of work at mental hospitals. This is one example of a real setting to look at what is happening to women. Suppose a class were trying

to understand the uses of mental illness in the oppression of women. Students might spend time interviewing female patients (most people in mental hospitals are female) to see what common case histories they have. Studies might be made of admission statistics that would include reason for admission and time of life large numbers of patients are admitted. For sure students would discover most women are admitted in late adolescence when adult roles are supposed to develop, after childbirth, and during menapause. Who could fail to understand that these are stress points when the prevailing ideology might not take hold.

In addition, large portions of time could be arranged away from school (see for example programs at Goddard, Antioch and Northeastern University where integral to education are both resident and non-resident semesters.) In my experience, the most real learning occurs in reflecting occurs in reflecting about what was happening in the real world as opposed to the school world of pure ideas.

And what about doing something well, being proud of ones own work? Part of the education of people in Cuba is that whatever work is created, whatever idea proposed by students is used in one or another area of Cuban society. Say if a student is studying workers at a particular factory, his ideas are taken seriously and his suggestions may be put into practice. Now in most areas of our society, there is no room for taking any student work seriously. We have experts for that. All is an exercise in thinking, so no wonder students so rarely put any more into papers than that. But we have a rare opportunity in Feminist Studies. No real work has been done by anyone in the history and lives of women as an underclass. Only among socialists in the 1930's and with the rise of Black Studies has any serious work been done on studies of how the common people lived. Women everywhere can begin to piece together oral histories of grandmothers, diaries from antique stores, letters buried in attics and obscure family mementoes to develop a history of the people. Popular views of what happened in specific time periods may be dispelled by such research. For example, the usual response people give when asked what they think about when you mention the 1920's is flappers. But in fact, there were more Wobblies in the 20's than flappers, although there were probably more flappers in the upper classes. And most people were neither. So there is ample opportunity for doing real research.

Likewise, most women keep journals and little writings of their own, but it is usually secretly and carefully hidden away. These writings are sources of understanding our own culture. Shared literary works of students that reflect the female experience and seek to communicate those reflections to others are the beginnings of building our collective identity. In both these examples the works of teacher and students are fundamentally equal in importance as work that contributes both to individual and collective self-esteem and to eliminating useless, competitive and hierarchal scholarship.

And what is done with these works in class is of equal importance to the fact that the work is done at all. Traditionally creative works are given to teacher to grade, then are passed back to student so she can ponder her successes and failures. Such a system only makes sense if

classification is at issue; not that students (or anyone) shouldn't learn to improve their work. A better method might be for a whole group in the sense of how a work could be improved and how each work contributes to the work and understanding of everyone in the group. Whereas grades reduce all but a few to feelings of failure, criticism done with this attitude works to make all feel good about their work, positive about improving it and strong about working together.

To push further, we are teaching not in isolation, but in relation to a revolutionary movement, and by this I mean in relation to all groups nationally and internationally who are also struggling with the submission/domination syndrome (colonization), and with the dialectic raised by finding an identity emerging out of the colonized position. We are not teaching just facts, or just knowledge, or just thought processes, or at least we shouldn't be. Our teaching is preparation for depth of action that actually attempts to change the colonized situation of women. In this regard, feminism is not entirely an academic discipline, and we shouldn't be embarrassed that it is not. It is one area in universities that's not an isolated enclave of intelligentia.

Cuban universities are places where the most advanced thought on the social, economic and technical direction of the country occur. In our country this is far from the case; big business is, while academia is synamous wither with ivory tower, or government supported laboratories for research in social control. As feminists we should see our most intimate connections with a movement outside the government or business. Our research and thought must begin to feed directly into the movement's actions so that our studies of patriarchy don't stop there, but actually develop strategies and directions for ending it.

V. Do People Learn in Schools?

Here we enter the foggy zone of the relation of a university to learning and to revolution. A decade ago the most revolutionary segment of our society was in the universities. Now we know they are no longer there, or whoever is left there has been quieted either by a knowledge that universities are not going to bend to student demands or that even if they could, they could, they have no power in the larger society anyhow. So we are finding larger and larger numbers of young people not in schools anymore. But does this mean they aren't learning?

Just the opposite. I think they are learning lots more than they would have in schools and that what is learned is profoundly of more relevance to building the society we envision that their stay-on-school friends. That's a pretty sweeping statement. For the last two years until coming to Goddard, I was part of a woman's collective. We published a newspaper called Off Our Backs, and then later some of us began to build a living collective as well. Women in the collective ranged in age from 17 to 32, but hierarchies were not defined by age. In publishing a newspaper, one must of necessity think about what is being printed, particularly since we were attempting to create a feminist philosophy in the content of what we printed. At its best time the collective functioned by printing nothing that had not had a thorough group discussion that at least clarified

differences, if it did not reach a consensus of framwork and theoretical content. To do this each member had to learn about those issues up for discussion: current news, the legal system, the history of the family, the role of romance in western civilization, etc. As collective members pushed themselves further intellectually, by necessity they challenged the foundations of their own lives, forcing change on many levels. This led many to leave monogamous marriages, join living collectives, begin lesbian relationships and so on.

Now I doubt that intellectual work done in the context of schools produced the profound intellectual and personal growth such a collective experience does, or at least I have never witnessed it. School is institutionalized with prescribed sets of responses. It's like a supermarket: You enter, choose brownies, milk and fruit, pay go through prescribed mazes to get out and hardly a quarter of your mind need work once you learn the ritual. In my year of teaching at Goddard, I've found that students learn the most through personal relationships with each other (either at couples or in the small, collective type cooking dorms we have), and not in classes. Every teacher knows this.

Now what can we do as feminists who hope our teaching means more than this? Well, the common threads through the times when one learns seem to be (1) when one wants to, and (2) when one's whole being is called into question and one is challenged to face the operating assumptions of daily life. In my own teaching I've tried to incorporate as many of these thinkings into our Feminist Studies Program as possible.

If learning occurs through being together, why not have collectives while in school: living and learning together. A women would have to choose to spend one semester at a minimum in a collective that planned its work together. As a group they all might study some basic theoretical works, but then they could split off and do separate work depending on interest, maybe in teams, but with constant discussion of what they are doing.

If exposure to the realities of women's lives outside the more equalitarian, but entirely mythological settings of school means a greater understanding, then much time should be planned in settings with other women: eg. mental hospitals, prisons, around welfare offices, at Planned Parenthood, at health clinics, at employment agencies, looking at where women work. This time could be incorporated into classes, but it might bw better to spend extended periods of time, so maybe it's important to encourage women to leave school for awhile to work in a factory or at the telephone company, or interviewing other women--old and young. Goddard has a work period so this is easier. Women who are still in the confines of school have less of the anger that women who are out in the real world feel. If it could be felt before graduation, maybe as teachers we could help each women discover some inter core of herself that will tide her through a life-long struggle against patriarchal odds.

VI. Do Survival Skills Belong in College?

College is a time of false equality. We all remember feeling very confident that we would never fall into the boring housewife or secretaraial routines of our mothers and older sisters when we were students and out to teach truth to the world. But most women, despite this dream, end up like that, B.A. or not. As feminist teachers wone of our prime responsibilities should be to dispell this myth so women can begin to combat it.

The education of men and women, even in co-ed schools has always been different. Most men think about what they are learning, which women spend their time thinking about who they are spending time with. Somehow, although on the surface public education seems the same for men and women, men develop a core of self and women don't. One of the most important tasks of a feminist teacher in college is to help women develop this core as solidly as possible. I know of no better way of doing it than to help a woman feel confident about being able to do something herself, most especially those skills that involve freeing her from dependence in surviving.

For this reason courses in manual survival are essential to the education of women, thought they may not be to that of men. Self-confidence, auto mechanics and carpentry are three I particularly recommend as quick confidence builders and as useful immediately for getting around. Most men have these skills from early childhood, so consider this training for college women like remedial reading given to black students in some college programs. It's necessary to advance further. In the case of women, this advancement is towards that core of self-confidence that's based on real skill and not on female wiles, etc.

It's easier to see the teacher role I've been describing in relation to skills courses. Take auto mechanics. There's a person who knows how to fix cars. She sets up a learning sequence and explains the function and working of each engine part. Then people begin to work on the part under discussion, say they clean spark plugs. Students ask questions as they arise, and the teacher occasionally looks over a shoulder or two to see what's happening. That's all; complete respect for the learner, group work together, sometimes in teams of two or three around each car, and a spirit of all growing stronger.

What about survival skills in relation to health and birth control on campus? In past years most college health clinics stayed miles away from even mentioning that there was such a thing as intercourse, let alone birth control. When forced to deal with it by increasing college pregnancies and by student demand, often there has been a shift in just the reverse direction. A few weeks ago some students at Goddard (which has a campus based, student run contraceptive counseling clinic for birth control, including abortion) met to discuss virgin oppression. They felt, virgins and non-virgins alike, that part of hip culture is that women are now all public fucks and the clinics were helping it along, although not consciously. Because of the social pressure to do it, they wanted to rediscuss the role of sex on campus. One of the primary concerns was that in introductory lectures, in counseling, and in all its activities, the contraceptive clinic should try

to talk about the pressures involved in being hip sexually. Again this question of objectivity arises. One can't just dispense birth control information in a society where the sexual revolution means not only more freedom for women, but more pressure, in this case to further the system of male authority. This pressure must be talked about to some degree. In addition, what about the pressure toward heterosexuality? Although this has not yet been included as part of the contraceptive counseling clinic's program, it would seem appropriate for them to have some information on lesbian sexuality.

These are examples the assumptions of which are that all that helps women survive and grow stronger are suitable for inclusion in a feminist studies program.

VII. How Does the Campus Relate to the Community?

Part of the American mobility mythology is that via education all who work hard can gain access to the upper classes, and therefore, to power. This is one of the reasons why most reform movements in this country have begun by agitating for education first (see women, blacks and immigrants). The basic assumption of those making this struggle is that either there are merits in the class system or that it is immutable. But as feminists, one of our primary struggles is against the existence of a class system, no matter who is on top.

So what does higher education for women mean in this regard? That some women are being trained as a separate class, a class above, those women who are not being trained. Furthermore, intellectual acrobatics and the mystification of knowledge are just the tools used to make those who have not been given a higher education feel they are inferior and therefore deserve to be ruled. Most often these acrobatics pass for nothing more than rhetoric and glibness ascribed to class polish.

Because of this double edged sword called higher education, we must be particularly attuned to the uses of our knowledge to oppress other women. Programs, beginning at the freshman level, of campus women working with community women in areas of learning which teach real skills rather than skills to class climb (although skills which make more money for women are not necessarily useless!) are a step in the right direction. Aside from medical skills, knowledge of women's history, the struggles of blacks and workers, communication skills like writing or graphics, all seem vital.

VIII. And What is the Point of Feminist Studies in Schools?

With all I've talked about, you can see that this is the most difficult question to deal with. Consciousness of our shaky position is hardly enough. We need models, and there are some from the past--workers schools of the 1930's. Many of these schools were set up by socialists involved in labor organizing. There were schools that spoke both to the needs of worker's intellectual and artistic development as people with a cultural identity to share, as well as to the need for organizing a working class opposition to a capitalist economy. So such schools con-

tained both courses in writing children's stories and in printing posters and leaflets. Of course there were many theory and history courses as well.

These schools were rarely part of established universities, at first, although there were some. Where they were, they were noticeably different. Those fun by colleges (Bryn Mawr had one) taught some facts and skills, but not the content behind the whole thing. They left out any analysis of a system that depended on wage laborers for profits for those who owned the corporations, and they excluded any consciousness of a worker identity or solidarity. Those that included these aspects as central to their curricula were separate from universitits, were constantly in financial difficulties and most finally closed. And so the whole worker education movement was soon coopted by universities anxious to cash in on the struggle but not to challenge the system that fed its scholars.

This same cooptation could happen with the women's movement if we are not conscious of what we are all about. We are part of a revolutionary movement whose goal is to end patriarchal rule, and included in that, class divisions in society. Our intellectual work is to understand our collective history, to join us closer in solidarity with all women, and to create a new order out of the depth of understanding from out studies. I think this still is possible within universities, but only if we don't lose sight of what we're about.

Lastly, I like to think that the point of Feminist Studies is to build strong women five healthy ways: in body, in skills, in depth of collective history, in need of each other to grow, and in practicality and energy to struggle against great odds. We will succeed as teachers if we reach only some of that.

IMAGES OF COMMITMENT

Joan E. Hartman

For the present I'd like to consider the images we use to define commitment to the academic profession, as opposed to the images others use and the correlation between their images and ours. Chiefly I describe my own, bound in space to New England women's colleges, and in time to the late 40's, when I was a student at one of them (Mount Holyoke), and the late 50's and early 60's, when I taught at two others (Wellesley and Connecticut). They turned out to be exceedingly persistent images for me; what I'd like to discuss is their persistence for others and what images, if any, we have to replace them.

The women who defined commitment for me are a vanishing if not a vanished breed, even at the women's colleges that were their natural habitat. Most of them received their doctorates before 1940, many of them from Bryn Mawr; I encountered more of them as teachers than as colleagues. Much like dons at Oxford before they were permitted to marry, these women were totally committed to the life of the colleges at which they taught. As an undergraduate I found them austere and impressive, not pathetic or comic. It was perhaps arrogant of me to assume that they had no life apart from the life of the college, but I think my lack of curiosity concerning that unseen life was the appropriate response to the dignity and strength of the life I saw. Moreover, as an undergraduate I too experienced commitment to intellectual discipline as commitment to the life of an institution, and found it rewarding..

When I chose to go to graduate school, however, I did not choose commitment as defined by these women; I rather rejected it because it implied the sacrifice of personal life as I conceived of it, though not, I think, as they conceived of it. I expected to commit myself sufficiently to a discipline without committing myself totally to an insititution, and in graduate school it seemed that was what I did. But when, doctor's degree finally in hand, I became a teacher, I found myself confronting images very like those I had rejected. The professional commitment of women, it seemed, to be commitment at all, must be total. This was and I think still is the measure by which others explicitly judge us, whether we teach in women's colleges or not; it is perhaps also the measure by which we judge ourselves.

A professional man may have various outside interests, all with claims on his time, and still be considered professionally committed. A professional woman I suspect may have but one, a husband and family, and they immediately call her commitment in doubt: at best she is considered professionally committed in spite of, not along with, their claims on her time. An unmarried woman I suppose would be allowed professional commitment in spite of time-consuming and depressing failures to acquire a husband and family, but I have never pled them as claims on my time and to do so would be both pathetic and comic. More pleadable claims, like entertaining, travel, tennis, music and ballet, though they sustain me in a life apart from my profession, tend to be regarded by those who judge my commitment as frivolous distractions. Moreover, at least until recently, I have acquiesced their measure of me.

The images of commitment I rejected as an undergraduate, then, have been more persistent than I expected them to be. Now, looking back, and especially looking back at the women whose colleague I became rather than those whose student I was, I have a better sense of the differences between their generation and mine and why they accepted the commitment I rejected. Most important, I think, society defined their options more clearly and realistically than it did mine. As students they were admitted to many undergraduate institutions, not only to the women's colleges, and in considerable numbers, but to few graduate institutions and, except for Bryn Mawr, the only woman's college to offer its own doctorate, in miniscule numbers. As faculty, with rare exceptions, they were admitted only to the women's colleges. With their expectations thus limited they selected themselves, and with great clarity of purpose.

Equally important, I think, the women's colleges where they taught strengthened them in their commitment. There, in the company of like-minded women, they created a collective life much to their taste. They frequently lived in complexes of small apartments with a common dining room and rejoiced to be liberated from domestic routine; they thought my generation daft because we like to cook. They enjoyed each other's company and were indeed good company, while we became depressed by the sameness of any fixed group, them or us. And they were bound to the company of each other, seldom alone, except of course when they worked; we preferred to choose our company and tolerated long period of solitude. In short, more varied ourselves, our taste was also more varied than theirs and we became loners perforce; we were bothered by the institutional commitment that strengthened them.

But the women's colleges also strengthened them by connecting them with the roots of women's liberation in America, the movement to secure their right to higher education, at least as undergraduates. In turn, assuming an hereditary right to lead, they kept the purpose of the founders alive for their students and enlarged it, so that those who stopped with the bachelor's degree nevertheless had a sense of sharing the experience of those who went beyond it; they fostered yet another kind of community among women. It is this kind of community that my generation seems to have lost; it needs to be revived, even in the women's colleges, and the women's movement beyond the colleges may well provide the impetus to do so. Perhaps its revival will generate images to replace those I have described, those troublesome images that for so long I myself used to define and measure commitment.

AHLUM, Carol
University of Massachusetts
Candidate for Master of Arts in Teaching

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Involvement as an undergraduate in a campus women's group that organized small group discussions, lectures, curriculum proposals, pregnancy and abortion counseling.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Assisting the Modern Language Association's Commission on Women to gather curricular materials about women's studies.

Projected involvement: working out concrete procedures for challenging and changing the sexist nature of public schools.

AICKIN, Mary Rothschild
University of Washington
Graduate Student: Predoctoral Lecturer, American Social History

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Local peripheral involvement in passing Abortion Reform Referendum; work with (house, counsel women) Abortion Referral Service. Some work in coalition of female groups at U of W campus for change in University

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Lectuer: "Introduction to Women's Stuies" - an interdisciplinary, core course, (coordinator); "History of Women's Rights and Feminism in America"; Advisor: Independent Study on Women in American History

Speaker: "Crisis in Education: Women", U of W Spring conference; Women's Liberation Forum: Women in U.S. History, Western Washington College ad hoc consulting at Evergreen College (still in the works!)

Specific Interests:
Ways in which women's studies lends itself to interdisciplinary study (breaking the old departmental holding, "college education exists to 'teach' undergraduates to be graduate students to be professors"); ways in which women's studies serve to interest students in areas which have become (though needn't be) uninteresting (an example in history is the reawakening of interests in <u>local</u> history when students can work at women's studies, their accomplishments and what they have given the locale.

Additional Information:
Oddly enough, I don't really see myself coming as an individual, but simply as a representative of a strong and active group which has already established (in record time!) a BA program in Woman Studies

ANGRIST, Shirley S.
Carnegie-Mellon University
Associate Professor, School of Urban and Public Affairs

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Research on women's role development since 1964.

Research Director of President Stever's Commission on the Status and Needs of Women at Carnegie-Mellon.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Member of Women of Carnegie-Mellon, a campus group concerned with women's studies, among other things.

Specific Interests:
Heriones and Role Models for Women

BALOGH, Paulette J.
Pittsburgh Assoc. for the Advancement of Women
Asst. Coordinator of Educational Programs, History

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Toronto Women's Liberation - Organizer for Women's Strike August 26, 1970 in 1970 in Hamilton, Ontario; University Committee for Women's Rights member; member Greater Pittsburgh Area Chapter N.O.W. - participant in August 26, 1971 celebration; Curriculum Subcommittee of Education Committee, Pennsylvanians for Women's Rights; participant, Pittsburgh Women's Political Caucus; Executive Board, P.A.A.W., a non-profit Education and Research Corporation designed to provide feminist programs as well as needed services to all women in the community.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Development of a course of study for history where the English and American women's movements are compared and contrasted chronologically, in principles, etc.

Development of a program for enhancing the self-image of women by analyzing their own sense of self, providing role models, etc.

Specific Interests:
What place should women's studies hold within the university e.g. administrative control. Relationship between university women's studies programs and non-university women in the community.

BART, Pauline B.
University of Illinois at the Medical Center, Chicago
Asst. Professor of Sociology in Psychiatry

Involvement - Woman's Movement:

Taught the first course on women in sociology at U.C. Berkeley in Spring 1969, have been teaching undergraduate courses and graduate seminars in sex roles and women ever since. One who suggested that those in sociology have a women's causus. Chairperson for education of Sociologists for women in society. In Berkeley, belonged to an "OWL (older womens liberation)" small group and to the Sociology Women's Caucus there (the only faculty member). In Chicago - member of the Chicago Women's Liberation Union and of the Association of Women Psychologists (my small group).

Involvement - Women's Studies:

As above - chairperson for education for SWS, nomination committee for officers of sex roles section of ASA, taught or am teaching two undergraduate and three graduate courses in the sociology of women or the sociology of sex roles. Integrate female studies into everything taught, consider it especially important when teaching medical students. Have edited two issues of Journal Marriage and the Fam. on sexism (really only ½ the November issue but the August issue is a double issue).

Specific Interests:

Female Sexuality

Additional Information:

Wrote the following articles relevant to female studies. "Mother Portnoy's Complaint" or in another version "Depression in Middle Aged Women" (the first in Trans-action, the second in Women in Sexist Society (based on my dissertation). Also wrote "Why Women's Status Changes in Middle Age," Social Structure and Vocabulary of Discomfort; What Happened to Female Hysteria" and have written with Linda Frankel The Student Sociologist's Handbook from a feminist perspective e.g. examples deal with women and we don't use he or him to refer to both men and women. My editorial for the Journal of Marriage and the Family will be in the November issue -"From the Gilded Cage To the Iron Cage: The Perils of Pauline" in which I don't hold back at all. I view the women's movement as an extended family, without which I would have a hard time surviving.

BARUCH, Grace
University of Massachusetts
Asst. Professor, Developmental Psychology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Member N.O.W., Boston Area Women Social Scientists.
Professional fields are sex roles, psychology of women.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
None, other than in psychology course planning.

BENKE, Virginia E.
University of Pittsburgh
TA, English Department

Involvement in Woman's Movement:
Member of the Radical Women's Union of Pittsburgh, helped edit a feminist journal The Opening, now working on developing a health collective for women in Pittsburgh.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Taught women poets in English 82 last year.

Specific Interests:
Role of gay liberation (gay students, gay teachers) in academia. How does a gay woman relate to women's studies? How do women's studies relate to gay women"

Additional Information:
Hi!

CARROLL, Constance M.
University of Pittsburgh
Director of Freshman Advising, CAS, Assistant Instructor, Classics.

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Chancellor's Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities (ACWO)
Liaison Officer to Vice-Chancellor for Finance (ACWO)
Member: Black Women's Task Force, University of Pgh.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Member, Women's Studies Task Force of ACWO

CASSIRER, Sidonie
Mount Holyoke College
Chairman, German Department

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Participation in meetings of Boston and Amherst groups.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
So far indirect. Reading materials for and about courses; attendance at workshops in Women's Studies at MLA meeting, December 1971; planning course on contemporary German women writers; member, Commission on Status of Women of MLA.

Specific Interests:
Does type and size of institution - large state U., private co-ed, or women's college - affect significantly the success of women's studies programs? How do foreign literature studies fit into the W.S. curriculum?

CHAPMAN, Gretel
Goucher College
Associate Professor, Chairman, Dept. of Visual Arts

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Workshop leader, Women in the Arts, sponsored by Goucher College, Women's Liberation and the Women's Liberation of Baltimore. Petitioned the Goucher College Chapter of the A.A.U.P. to establish a Committee W.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
January Term course to be given 1972: Eve and Mary, Polar Images of the Woman in the Visual Arts.

COPANS, Ruth
University of Massachusetts
Undergraduate, English

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
For the past couple of years, worked on and off with small women's groups at U. of Mass. on such projects as day care. These small groups enabled me to tune in on what was going on in the rest of the city and gave a great deal of exposure to the women's movement throughout the city.

Involvement in Women's Studies:
Have taken as many courses as I possibly could at U. of Mass. that relate to Women's Studies. Unfortunately, there have been tragically few. This does however, include a history seminar on women and two English courses. (These limitations alone serve to reemphasize the incredibly need to establish a permanent women studies department.) Will also be conducting a small seminar on the theme of Women and Madness in Literature for several weeks in November, as part of a larger course on Women in Literature.

DAVIS, Devra Lee
Queens College, City University of New York
Asst. Professor, Sociology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
No formal tie, many marches, a guerilla skit, an abortion suit against D.C. General Hospital on behalf of a thirteen year old woman.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Presently teaching a course on women and society (syllabus enclosed); have guest lectured on the history and sociology of women in New York.

Specific Interests:
Is there a place for men in women's studies (not sure)

DAVIS, Kathy Anne
University of Pittsburgh
Undergraduate, CAS, Women's Studies/Sociology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Rap groups, action against '71 KQV Bridal Fair, Abortion Justice Association, Pitt Undergraduate Women's Union, CMU High School Project.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Courses taken, major declared in, working toward Women's Studies Program at Pitt, committee member, housing chairman Women and Education: A Feminist Perspective.

Specific Interests:
Involvement of ungergraduate women in this, as yet, an underdeveloped field, i.e. developing curricula, planning majors.

DeHAVEN, Dara
Duke University
Undergraduate, History

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Became interested by doing research on the history of the Equal Rights for Women Amendment to the Constitution. Am now doing independent study in women's history under Dr. Anne. Scott.

FEIG, Dr. Konnilyn G.
University of Pittsburgh
Director of Special Programs
Administration/History

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Member, NOW, WEAL; Director of first US Government Institute on women -- "Crisis: Women in Higher Education," Project Director - new USOE Project for regional/national networks on affirmative action, Producer - Educational TV film under US Government grant - Women in Higher Education.

Involvement in Women's Studies:
Peripheral

FELSTINER, Mary
Sonoma State College
Asst. Professor, History

Involvement in Women's Studies:
Teaching Women and History.

FERGUSON, Mary Anne
University of Massachusetts
Associate Professor, English

Involvement - Women's Movement:
Professionally: member of the MLA Commission on the Status of Women and of the Women's Caucus for the Modern Languages.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Devised and taught an experimental course in "The Images of Women in Literature" last year; it is now a permanent catalog offering and I'm trying to interest others in teaching it and in getting a program of women's studies going.

Specific Interests:
How to keep from having schizophrenia if one has already an established academic field and is just into women's studies.

Additional Information:
Have just delivered a ms. for an anthology based on the syllabus of my course to Houghton-Mifflin which is going to take a year to get it out. Where will my ideas be then: Just putting them down makes me realize they are still taking shape.

GANE, Gill
Cambridge/Goddard College
Faculty, Graduate School of Social Change

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Last year a student in the Women's History seminar at the Cambridge-Goddard Graduate School for Social Change, and this year a member of the faculty collective at the same.

GENTEMANN, Karen
University of Pittsburgh
Special Asst. (Office of the Provost)

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Year-long study at Pitt on women's opportunities, attendance at conferences. Staff on Institute on Women in Higher Education.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Conferences but have not taught or taken a women's course.

Specific Interests:
Necessity of including cultural perspective in women's studies programs.

GOLD, Alice
Wesleyan University
Instructor, Psychology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Have attended meetings of several organizations but have never participated fully in them, mostly I've been a sympathetic bystander.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Have just completed four years of graduate school at Columbia and have begun teaching this fall. In the spring I will be giving a seminar in the psychology of women and assisting in S. Tobias' course on women's studies at Wesleyan.

GOLDSMITH, Marilynn
University of Pittsburgh
Asst. Professor, Biology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
No formal affiliation with women's groups other than the Abortion Repeal Movement, pregnancy and contraception counselling at Pittsburgh Free Clinic, member of Advisory Council on Women's Opportinities at University of Pittsburgh, member, Women's Political Caucus in Pittsburgh.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Member, Task Force on Women's Studies of ACWO. Guest lecturer to several women's studies courses on Women in the Natural Sciences and Biology of Women - Anatomy vs Destiny theme. Have developed a course outline on Developmental and Reproductive Biology of Women to be taught hopefully in the Biology Department here, probably in the new Woman's Studies Program.

Specific Interests:
Career opportunities and modern counseling of women undergraduates for professional careers is an are of vital importance in universities, often overlooked. Corrective measures to redirect women students who have been channeled along traditional lines in high school and before. (Remedial counselling????)

GORDON, Linda
Cambridge-Goddard Graduate School
Asst. Professor, Women's History

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Deeply involved with Bread and Roses.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Have organized and developed a feminist studies program at Cambridge-Goddard; also teach women's history at U. Mass., Boston,

GREENWALD, Maurine
Brown University
Graduate Student, American Studies

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
One of the founders of Rhode Island Women's Liberation Union. Involved in organizing series of forums on women at Brown. Involved in women's caucus of New University Conference. Involved in teaching women's history to women in Rhode Island outside university.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Taught women's history at Brown two years ago. Presently teaching women's history at Rhode Island College, presently writing dissertation on feminist movement in early 20th centruy.

Specific Interests:
Beyond curriculum change: women's studies as radical politics. Why women's studies? Who controls? Who funds?

HARTMAN, Joan E.
Staten Island Community College
Asst. Professor, English (lit. of the Renaissance and earlier 17th century)

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
It has been professional, largely through the MLA Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession; because of my experience as a student and teacher at women's colleges, I am equally interested in the problems of teaching women and the problems of the women who teach them.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
None as yet, though I hope to be involved in a course for undergraduates and perhaps also a program in Adult Continuing Education.

Specific Interests:
Are women teachers different?

HEDGES, Elaine R.
Towson State College
Assoc. Professor of English

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Member of the Commission on the Status of Women of the Modern Language Association of America. (Our activities have included a fact-finding survey, to determine extent of discrimination vs. women; an affirmative action plan; research into present women's studies programs and courses.) Also active on my campus: member Committee on Status of Women. Speeches to local groups.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Teaching about women in sections of courses. Co-author of grant proposal to establish an interdisciplinary program in women studies at Towson State. Research and writing (for intended publication) on Charlotte Perkins Gilman.

Specific Interests:
What are special strategies for teaching men?

The emerging feminist criticism: its opportunities and its hazards. (read 40 manuscripts this summer, for consideration for next December's MLA meeting, and I am concerned about the oversimplifications they displayed.)

Additional Information:
My college has been reluctant to recognize Women's Studies, although I'm confident that by next year we shall have at least a few courses. (We have one now, in the history department). How best to get courses instituted? The feasibility of applying for foundation money.

HOFFMAN, Nancy Jo
Portland State University
Asst. Professor, English

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
From full-time (almost) activism in the male left of the early 60's naturally and necessarily into the women's movement by 1969--even then I was a slow learner. Since I've taught Literature by Women for three years, organized and participated in small rap groups, have lectured, run work-shops, but have yet to resolve the ambivalence I have about women's studies as the women's movement, which is how it is for me right now. We have drawn community women into our university program, but haven't really moved out into the community in any significant way.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
I've been the informal organizer with another woman faculty member of our women's studies program which is now moving along rapidly, almost too fast for the students and faculty involved. We have about ten courses this Fall, a certificate proposal (minor) in the works, and a tremendous amount of energy. We're still a sub rosa department--no funding, no official recognition, and like it that way.

Specific Interests:
I'm most interested in the interdisciplinary aspect of women's studies and would like to talk to a feminist psychologist and sociologist particularly because I find myself in need of concepts and a vocabulary which doesn't exist in the traditional social sciences. Also, under strategies perhaps; a subheading which has to do with my position paper--self-images for the new woman; that is, how do we make our courses creative supportive of new ways for women to be in the world?

HORNSTEIN, Gail
University of Pittsburgh
Undergraduate student, Psychology

Involvement - Woman's Movement"
Co-founder, Pittsburgh Women's Liberation. Member, Chancellor's Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities, Chairman, Student Affairs Task Force. Participant numerous conferences on women's movement. Associate Director, U.S.O.E. Summer Institute, "Crisis: Women in Higher Education."

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Aided in development of Pitt's women's studies proposal, developed core curriculum in women's studies for U.S.O.E. summer institute, "Crisis: Women in Higher Education."

JOYCE, Kathleen M.
University of Pittsburgh
Undergraduate, English (my real field is carpentry)

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
I have been a member of several small informal groups and organized a very effective demonstration at the KQV Bridal Fair last spring. I believe that women's liberation is a concept and a philosophy that has been intimately incorporated into my life. I am committed to its ultimate goals.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
I have attended three separate women's studies courses and have been actively working for the passage of the women's studies proposal at the University of Pittsburgh. I did work on the steering committee for this conference.

KITZEROW, Phyllis Grace
University of Pittsburgh
Teaching Fellow, Sociology

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Taught (team) Women's Role in Society, Jan. 1971 and Sept. 1971.
Taught (with Malinda Orlin) Myth and Reality

Specific Interests:
What effect, if any, do these courses have?

KLEINBERG, Susan J.
University of Pittsburgh
Teaching Fellow, History of Women

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
One of the founders of Pittsburgh Women's Liberation. Pregnancy and birth control counselor for the Pittsburgh Free Clinic.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Involved in getting a women's studies program at Pitt. Teaching History and Social Role of Women since Winter term, 1969 - a course dealing primarily with the effect of technology on women's roles in American society. Writing doctoral dissertation on comparing working class women in Great Britain and America at the end of the 19th century, focusing on the differences in the work roles and the effects of these roles on the family structure and power relations within the family.

KROUSE, Agate Nesaule
Wisconsin State University
Asst. Professor, English

Involvement - Woman's Movement:

Participation in an informal women's liberation group of students and faculty members; talks on feminism to such assorted groups as a Newcomers Club, a Latvian sorority, an informal discussion group of housewives, classes on the Changing Individual in American Studies; a successful campaign to remove Maternity Leave without pay for faculty and staff and to have the 40-day Sick Leave extended to incapacity related to pregnancy; letters to the editor on various women's issues.

Involvement - Women's Studies:

Drawing up a course on Women in American Culture three years ago, which is currently being offered in the American Studies Department (published in Female Studies II, due to be included in the anthology being prepared at Wayne State); co-authoring another course on Women in Literature (also in F.S. II); currently writing a dissertation on The Feminism of Doris Lessing, which should be finished by June and which should provide me with the basis for including feminism in various other courses.

Specific Interests:

Almost anything that interests me can probably be discussed under those general headings.

Additional Information:

I am looking forward to talking informally to other women about ways to make time to pursue academic interests, about the personal conduct of women teachers (what place does charm, or anger, or proof that we can do various "male" things have in the classroom?), about the relative success they have had on non-competitive, co-operative academic projects. I would also like to meet anyone interested in Doris Lessing or modern literature generally. At the risk of sounding trivial, I should mention I'd like to meet any Latvians or any enthusiastic gardeners.

LANDY, Marcia
University of Pittsburgh
Assoc. Professor of English and Comparative Literature

Involvement - Woman's Movement"
Chairwoman of Child Care, Women's Cuacus MLA. Member, Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities, University of Pittsburgh.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Have taught two courses on women: "Literary and Social Views of Women," "The Mythology of Women." Chairwomen on Women's Studies Task Force Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities, University of Pittsburgh.

LERNER, Gerda
Sarah Lawrence College
Assoc. Professor, American History - Women's History

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
I have been active in various aspects of the woman's movement for thirty years, most of it organizing women on a community level. I am a founding member of NOW, although not active in the organization. Founding member and 1 year co-chairman of CCWHP (Coordinating Committee on Women in the Historical Profession) and founding member of New York Historians.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
It has been my (unofficial) specialty since I did my dissertation on the Grimke sisters. I have lectured on women's history since 1963 and taught women's history starting in 1962 at the New School and fr one year at Sarah Lawrence College, where I am now teaching such a course. I have published several articles and three books on women's history.

Additional Information:
I would like to discuss: Why women's studies and what are special strategies for teaching women?

LEWIS, Eleanor J.
University of Michigan
Graduate Student, Ph.D. Candidate, Psychology of Women

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Active organizing students and employees at University of Michigan. Collected data to assist HEW investigation of Michigan, assist employees in going through grievance procedure at University of Michigan. Speak to and teach classes on psych of women, sex-role developments and differences. A founding member and officer of Probe Into Status of Women at the University of Michigan.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Took courses in psychology of women, anthropoligical studies of women.

Specific Interests:
The strategies of politics of establishing and maintaining a women's studies program. The role of men in a women's studies program. Psychology and law; medical treatment of women; men - their reactions to women's liberation.

MATLACK, Cynthia
University of Pittsburgh
Asst. Professor, English

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
NOW, ACWO, teaching

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Teaching - usually in women dramatists and theatrical structures - The theater and role conceptions - actresses and dramatists.

Specific Interests:
Definition of current issue-oriented curricula ambivelance and the study of the "traditional" humanistic areas, location of new women writers.

NEWELL, Barbara W.
University of Pittsburgh
Assoc. Provost for Graduate Study and Research, Professor of Economics

Involvement - Woman's Movement"
Chairman of the University of Michigan Commission on Women.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
As academic program aid for the President of the University of Michigan.

OEMANN, Carol
Wesleyan University
Assoc. Professor, English

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Member, MLA Commission on Women, 1970-1971.
Chairman, MLA Commission on Women, July 1, 1971 --

Involvement in Women's Studies:
Teaching for the 2nd time a course in 19th and 20th century English women writers. Editing, with Elaine Showalter, Female Studies IV.

Specific Interests:
How to change lives, raise consciousness, yet preserve analytical rigor, intellectual disciplines. How feminist consciousness helps with research in one's own field; how does it help discover new material or new interpretation of old.

ORLIN, Malinda
University of Pittsburgh
Graduate School of Social Work, Doctoral Student

Involvement - Woman's Movement"
Very little organizationally - a great deal personally.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Taught in two undergraduate sociology courses.

Specific Interests:
Is it valid to divide people by "awareness" and "committment."? Anybody interested in women and public policy-program evaluation courses?

PERSOFF, Melanie Kaye
University of California, Berkeley
Acting Instructor, English, French & Latin, Renaissance emphasis

Involvement - Woman's Movement:

Member of small women's liberation group for 1½ years; member of Departmental Women's Caucus; participated in planning the Campus Women's Forum (bi-weekly gatherings where women doing research on women could present their work).

Involvement - Women's Studies"

The Campus Women's Forum; with the other members of the Women's Caucus in my department got the chairman to agree to a Women and Literature course which I will be teaching this spring. Also attended the Santa Cruz conference on Women's Studies last spring.

Specific Interests:

How can you relate a single women's course to the movement and to the community (i.e., keep it from being just another hip course)? How to bring feminism into a non-women's course" How--administratively--to set up a women's studies program: Right now Berkeley doesn't have women's studies, so our special needs gather around how to get them and what to do--how to make do--until we get them. I am alsoespecially interested in interdisciplinary courses: literature, psychology and sociology (history, too; also, the other arts).

Additional Information:

I am currently working on my dissertation on "The Woman Hero in Jacobean Tragedy," and will probably be dealing with Greek Tragedy and Classical French Tragedy as well; so I am especially anxious to meet women who are doing women's research, etc.

PORTER, Nancy
Portland State University
Asst. Professor, English

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Mainly activities related to Women's Studies at Portland State--speeches, community panels, liaison with Oregon Council For Women's Equality, etc., organizing academic and classified women employees at Portland State.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
With students and Nancy Hoffman, developed and direct Women's Studies and Resource Center at Portland State, which has offered around twenty courses in the last year to approximately six hundred students. Also have taught Lit by Women.

Sepcific Interests:
I hope we don't have to spend time justifying Women's Studies. I'm interested in what goes on in the classroom and in discussion groups. I'm also concerned with developing new paridigms of discussion and research--a truly inter-disciplinary, problem-centered and future oriented approach to, for instance, psych-biology and literature. I'd like to explore with women from other disciplines what might be fruitful questions to ask in an inter-disciplinary study.

Additional Information:
May I urge that we not present ourselves as victims studying the era of our slavery and demanding compensation, that we do see ourselves as indeed capable of evolving and influencing our own evolution as people as well as the academic (for lack of better word) areas we study.

REEVES, Nancy
University of California at Los Angeles
Instructor, Council for Educational Development, Women's Studies

Involvement - Woman's Movement:

Keynote speech international conference Copenhagen, 1960, one of ten American women selected to meet with ten Soviet women for a week-long cnference on outstanding issues held in Moscow, 1964.... with the approval of both governments. Radio Series: A WOMAN'S PLACE prepared for Pacifica Foundation 1965. Background Paper, Conference, New york Academy of Sciences, 1970, Publications in US, England, Sweden, Poland.

Involvement - Women's Studies:

Initiated course entitled: Stereotypes of Woman's Place at UCLA in 1969, published syllabus prepared for that course under the same title. This syllabus has now been incorporated into a textbook with readings in parallel, published by Aldine-Atherton, Inc., and entitled: Womankind: Beyond the Stereotypes. Am now teaching an augmented version of the original course at UCLA under the title: Woman's Place: Stereotypes and Assumptions.

Specific Interests:

Are we discussing courses about women or courses for women?

Additional Information:

My profession is law. I am a member of the Bar in New York and also in California. I began to write about the position of women in society in Sweden where I lived to two years and have continued to do. I am a member of the Fedn. Internationale des Femmes Juristes and also of Assn. Internationale des Femmes des Carrieres Juridiques.

ROSENTHAL, Judy
Fresno State College
Asst. Professor, English and American Literature

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Established women's center, Fresno, Calif., member of Board of Directors, member Radical Women's Union, Pittsburgh 1970-71. Member, Pittsburgh Women's Liberation 1969-1970. Member, University Committee for Women's Rights 1969-1971. Contributor to feminist journal The Opening - Pittsburgh, 1971 (article on Janis Joplin). Staffed Pittsburgh women's center 1971.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Member, Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Women's Opportunities at University of Pittsburgh, Childcare and Women's Studies Task Force. Taught four women's courses - Pitt: History and Social Role of Women, Views of Women, Women in Literature; Fresno: Contemporary Women Writers.

Specific Interests:
I am most interested in overcoming the passive conditioning of women students. We need new teaching methods - women are lectured to all their lives! I have tried various sensitivity training exercises - encounter, role-playing - to bring women out.

Additional Information:
I am now involved in feminist performances (guerrilla theater with use of women's personal mythologies). These occur randomly around the city - latest was "Annubis Rides Again," next "Sleeping Beauty Wakes Up."

ROSENTHAL, Robin Felice
Barnard College
Undergraduate, Psychology

Involvement - Woman's Movement"
Abortion March on State Capitol in Albany, Nov. 1970.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Have taken courses in Women in Literature, American Women's History, an interdisciplinary study-female and male (using departments of anthropology, biology, psychology and sociology). I am planning research in psychological differences between men and women.

Specific Interests:
What programs are already being developed and where?

Additional Information:
I am planning on doing graduate research in psychology of women.

RUDT, Ellen
PMC College
Instructor, Sociology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Member: National Organization for Women, University of Pgh. - University Committee for Women's Rights, Women's Political Caucus, Sociologists for Women in Society.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Co-instructor at Pitt, in course: "Women's Changing Role in Society"
Co-instructor at PMC, in course: "Women in American Society"
Instructor at PMC in upcoming course (January): "Feminism: Past, Present and Future" - Research: Paper presented (October 30, 1971) at Penna. Sociological Society Meetings: "The Sources and Content of the Women's Liberation Movement"

Specific Interests:
Research and developing 'education' material

SEAGERT, Susan C.
City University of New York
Graduate Student, Environmental Psychology, Social Psychology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Conciousness raising group member, Ann Arbor Women's Action Coalition

Involvement - Women's Studies:
My main involvement has been in the study of the psychology of women, first as a student in a course on this topic and now as one of the coordinators setting up a research seminar and information service for New York Feminist Psychologist Coalition.

Specific Interests:
Women and problem-solving; social structure and socialization for non-achievement; how to think about achievement as a goal.

SCHULBERGER, Sharon Yvonne
Slippery Rock State College
Undergraduate, Sociology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Slippery Rock Women's Liberation - since January, 1970, Association for Women's Rights - president, Pennsylvanians for Women's Rights - co-founder, on Education Committee, traveled cross-country in an old school bus this summer meeting with WLM groups. Edit the HAND THAT ROCKS THE ROCK - A women's newsletter.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
For over a year I have been trying to establish a feminist course on campus (things look good for spring). Also, I am a member of the PWR Education Committee, female studies subcommittee, which is working with PDE and PHRC to establish feminist studies on all levels of education next term.

SCHMIDT, Dolores Barracano
Slippery Rock State College
Asst. Professor, English, American Studies

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
I am faculty advisor to a student group, Association for Women's Rights. Also active in Slippery Rock Women's Liberation, a community group, and a member of the staff which puts out its newsletter, "The Hand That Rocks the Rock - Slippery Rock Women's Liberation." I have worked with the Women's Commission of both the Modern Language Assoc. and the American Studies Association and am presently program director of the Women's Caucus for the Modern Languages. I am a member of the Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education, a two-year research-implementation program co-sponsored by Pennsylvanians for Women's Rights and the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
I am presently working on a course, "Research Writing: Aspects of Feminism" and a community study group on the contemporary women's movement. Slippery Rock has no women's studies Program, but an active student group is presently conducting a campaign to get one started. They have extracted promises from several department chairmen. Many women, of course, myself included, have added feminist units to existing courses: semantics, literature.

Specific Interests:
"Teaching the Teachers" - 70% of Elementary Education majors in college today are women. They are, for the most part, being taught by men. What courses, strategies, experiences should be incorporated into teacher-training programs to indure a high level of feminist consciousness and at least a chance that new graduates will run non-sexist classes and avoid destructive sex-role stereotyping?

Additional Information:

I am presently working on a textbook monitoring project in conjunction with the Pennsylvania Department of Education and wonder whether women from various disciplines and regions would like to establish a program whereby information on sexist textbooks could be pooled. (See form on position paper) In Pennsylvania we are distributing forms to feminist groups, PTA's, librarians, teachers, parents, and students on college campuses through classes or student women's rights groups. I think a valuable fund of information pointing to particular problems related to a certain discipline or publisher could be built up fairly quickly through such cooperation. Would others engaged in research relevant to such a project or in cooperating and/or assisting with theis work please contact me.

SCHUMACHER, Dorin
University of Pittsburgh
Teaching Fellow, French and Comparative Literature

Involvement - Woman's Movement:

Member, Chancellor's Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities. Member, Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education, Sex-segregated Classes Committee (Pa. Dept. Education-Pennsylvanians for Women's Rights-Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission)

Involvement - Women's Studies:

Teaching women's studies course Winter 1972.

SHEEHAN, Cynthia
University of Pittsburgh
Research Asst.,Maternal and Child Health Dept., Sociology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:

Brief membership in Pittsburgh Radical Women's Union. Attended two local conferences on women.

Involvement - Women's Studies:

With several other women, I designed and taught an undergraduate sociology course called "Women's Role in Society" at the University of Pittsburgh in winter term 1971 and this term. I was also involved in a graduate seminar on women in the sociology department at Pitt last year.

SHERWIN, Susan S.
Cornell University
French Literature - 16th Century

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Berkely Chapter of NOW, conferences "Women in Transition" - Feminist Press West

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Only since my arrival at Cornell have I actually been involved in a program. Cornell is in the process of creating an on-going curricula, and I should like to learn more from people further along.

Specific Interests:
Women's studies at a discipline (Programs? Departments? Grad. Fields?)
Radical feminists as an intellectual force on campuses.

SIMMONS, Adele
Jackson College, Tufts University
Dean, Asst. Professor, History

Involvement - Woman's Movmenet:
NOW and WEAL. Particular concern for the development of affirmative action programs and for being a focus for consiousness raising amoung undergraduates.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
History and Psychology of Women - Taught jointly with a psychologist - Aellaluria. Seminar on 19th Century Women in America.

Specific Interests:
What are the strategies for introducing women's studies into curricula.
How can we enlarge women's networks for faculty and top administrative hiring?

SIPORIN, Rae Lee
University of Pittsburgh
Asst. Professor, Asst. Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Medieval Literature and Linguistics

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Member Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities, Liaison to Health Professions for Women's Opportunities, consciousness raising talks, participation in panels and talks on women's opportunities in higher education.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Member of Task Force on Women's Studies, Director, Women and Education: A Feminist Perspective, Nov. 5-7, 1971. Participation in women's studies conferences.

Specific Interests:
Importance of language in teaching women. Administration and coordination of women's studies programs.

SKLUT, Ann
University of Pittsburgh
Academic Advisor, Counselor, Education

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities, University of Pittsburgh.
Women's Caucus of American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Course on Woman as Professionsl, Counselor Ed. Social systems course.

Specific Interests:
Counseling women - Women and the professions.

SMALOVER, Miriam
University of Pittsburgh
Undergraduate, Women's Studies and Sociology

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Rap group 70-71, Carnegie-Mellon University high school project (talking about women's liberation to high shcool students) Member of Abortion Justice Association, Picketed Pittsburgh Bridal Fair. Member Pitt Undergraduate Women's Union.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Taken 3 of 4 courses offered at Pitt. Worked for passage of women's studies program here, member of conference committee for Women and Education: A Feminist Perspective. Will double major in women's studies and scociology.

Sepcific Interests:
What are further economic uses of student in women's studies after graduation?

STIMPSON, Catharine R.
Barnard College
Asst. Professor, English - Acting Director, Barnard Women's Center

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
I joined the movement in 1966, in New York, working with the New York chapter on NOW during its first days. Have concentrated most of my energies on the new feminism within the university and at a women's college, as well as doing some writing and lecturing.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
I have both taught a course (Images of Women in Literatire) and helped to establish a women's studies program at Barnard.

Specific Interests:
The relationship of women's studies to community colleges, to the community at large, and to male students; the question of the relationship of women's studies courses to consciousness-raising among the students.

Additional Information:
Have enclosed a paper on "Women as Scapegoats." It is one part of a larger theme: the use and misuse of the sense of women as victims. This opens up questions about which models we use in women's studies courses. Do we see women as subjugated, or do we pay more attention to Mary Beard, and see women as a more active force?

TOBIAS, Shelia
Wesleyan University
Associate Provost, Lecturer in History

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Responsibilites at Wesleyan for female staffing, women's studies courses and programs, relations with women in the community and equal employment guidelines.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Have taught three different multi-disciplinary courses on women.

Specific Interests:
Getting research support.

TRECKER, Janice Law
Free Lance Writer
Education, Women's History

Involvement - Woman's Movement"
Work with Central Conn. NOW, Conn. Committee for equal rights.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Research on treatment of women in secondary school history texts, (article pub. Social Education 1971). Research on women's studies courses (Saturday Review October, 1971), research and writing film strip scripts on women's history (USA) high school level (not yet in production). Research on material on women in Conn. history for State Department of Education (Conn.). Also, research, writing on Isabella B. Hooker (Connecticut's pioneer suffragist) and on the political implications of the suffrage prisoners of the Wilson Administration (1917-18)

Specific Interests:
What can be done to facilitate teaching about women and their history on the secondary school level? What can be done in the way of developing materials for this level? What can be done to facilitate exchange of information on research in women's studies.

WEBB, Marilyn Salzman
Goddard College
Faculty, Feminist Studies Program

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Helped to organize first national women's liberation conference, small conference, Sandy Springs, Md., August, 1968 and a large conference, Chicago, Nov., 1968. Helped organize D.C women's liberation, speaking groups, etc. Helped organize D.C. Women's Liberation Counseling Center, 1969. Co-founded Off Our Backs, a women's liberation newspaper, January, 1970. Much speaking nationally, as well as articles in many underground women's papers. (convered women's liberation news for The Guardian before we began Off Our Backs, 1968-70. Was part of a women's collective - work collective and then became a living collective

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Founder of the Feminist Studies Program at Goddard College, Sept., 1970. Faculty in Feminist Studies since September, 1970.

Specific Interests:
What should be the relationship between women in the university and in the community? How should women's studies relate to the women's movement outside of the university? To the rest of the university? Day care on campus-how can we set it up?

Additional Information:
I have a child (Jennifer - 1½) who dirties lots of clothes, I work with a women's dorm collective that is perpetually having crises, I worry that students might not enjoy class and argue perpetually with administrators about the importance of women's studies. In between I try to read for class, talk to students, cook, clean, wish more women would come to Vermont and try to write short stories (most of which get scribbled over with Jennifer's stories.) Thank God my mind isn't becoming rarefied! It's one advantage we have over men!

WEISS, Judith C.
Goddard College
Faculty, Special Education

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
Intellectually and in small consciousness raising groups, for the past two years.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Just beginning to teach my regular courses with a feminist perspective, have participated in women's forums and helped with the women's studies dorm here. Am planning a course on women and education.

WHITMORE, Kay E.
State University of New York, College at Old Westbury
Asst. Professor, Social Science

Involvement - Woman's Movement:
None in the movement per se. Primarily I have stayed abreast of the issues and activities and I worked with the Pittsburgh Institute this past summer.

Involvement - Women's Studies:
I am currently a part-time instructor in the women's program at Old Westbury; I'll provide some cross-cultural perspective and discuss Black American responses to the movement.

Specific Interests:
As a sub-topic to the topic, Why Women's Studies, I would like to discuss the inclusion in a curriculum of materials from various cultures about women.

DICKISON, Shelia
Wellesley College
Classics

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Teaching a course on Women in the Ancient World

MARTIN, Susan
Antioch College, Ohio
Sociology

Involvement - Women' Studies:
Several conferences in the field of sociology

RICKS, Lena
Antioch College, Ohio

Involvement - Women's Studies:
Representation of Black women.

GLICKMAN, Eileen
University of Pittsburgh
Communications

MORLOCK, Laura L.
Johns Hopkins University
Staff Assistant, Sociology

Involvement - Women's Studies:

Research consultant to the Modern Language Association Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession for two studies. The first study was an investigation of the status of women within a random sample of all modern language departments. The second is a study of structural barriers to the full participation of women in Ph.D. granting departments. The latter study is concerned especially with departmental policies and plans for Affirmative Action to insure equal opportunities for women students and faculty members. I'm working on a report summarizing and comparing studies on the status of women in various academic disciplines. The report will be published as a chapter in a book edited by Alice Rossi.

Specific Interests:

Should the education of men and women prepare them for different life styles.

Additional Information:

I'm working with Florence Howe and Carol Ahlum on the design for a study of women's courses in the United States. We hope to receive suggestions from conference participants on the study design and the substance of the questionnaire.

ARENSBERG, Lilly
University of Pittsburgh
English

BENKE, Ginny
University of Pittsburgh
English

CLANAGAN, Mazzeta
University of Pittsburgh

DONNELLY, Nancy
University of Pittsburgh
English

FEDANZO, Shelly
Sonoma State
History

HOLLANDER, Gayle
Hampshire College
Political Science

HOWE, Florence
MSA Commission on the Status of Women

KERR, Judy
Portland State
English

O'CONNOR, Teresa
Staten Island Community College
English

SALPER, Roberta
State University of New York
Hispanic

SCOTT, Ann
Duke University
History

SOCHEB, June
Northeast Illinois University
History

STELBOUM, Judith
Staten Island Community College
English

STOCKER, Elaine
University of Chicago
Psychology

TYLER, Peggy Chambers
Douglass College
Psychology

WILLIAMS, Marcie
Portland State
Philosophy

ZUCHLEWSKI, Pearl
University of Pittsburgh
History